ED 030 171 24 CG 004 214

By-Winger, Leland J.
The Application of A Special Counseling Technique to Maladjusted Under-Achievers; A Pilot Project. Final Report.
Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
Bureau No-BR-6-8902
Pub Date Aug 68
Grant-OEG-4-7-068902-2954
Note-115p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$5.85
Descriptors-Achievement Tests, *Counseling Programs, Dropout Rehabilitation, Dropouts, *Educational Research, *Maladjustment, *Measurement Instruments, Self Concept, *Underachievers, Youth

This research tests, in a school situation, the ability of the "Otto Self-Concept Improvement Counseling Technique" (OSCICT), when applied to maladjusted underachievers, to improve their self-concept and scholastic ability. In an attempt to measure the effectiveness of the OSCICT on employability of participants, a followup was made six months after the students left the program. The three groups used in this study were drawn from enrollees of two Manpower Development and Training Act Special Youth Projects in Utah, in 1966-68. It was hypothesized that members of the Experimental Group would have lower ending scores on both the California "F" Scale and the Mooney Problem Checklists, and higher ending scores on the Winger Behavior Inventory, Iowa Tests of Educational Development, and the Lorge-Thorndike. It was further hypothesized that the effects of the OSCICT would carry over to the world of work. Most hypotheses were substantiated. Followup results were inconclusive for lack of sufficient returns for statistical analysis. The author recommends the OSCICT as an effective method for improving a maladjusted underachiever in the areas of personality deficiencies. Tables of test findings are appended. (Author/CJ)

ED0 30171

BR 68902
PA24

OE-BR

FINAL REPORT

Project No. 6-8902
Grant No. O.E. 4-7-068902-2954

THE APPLICATION OF A SPECIAL COUNSELING TECHNIQUE TO MALADJUSTED UNDER-ACHIEVERS - A PILOT PROJECT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

August, 1968

U. S. Department of
Health, Education, and Welfare

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

004214

FINAL REPORT

Project No. 6-8902

Grant No. O.E. 4-7-068902-2954

THE APPLICATION OF A SPECIAL COUNSELING TECHNIQUE TO MALADJUSTED UNDER-ACHIEVERS--A PILOT PROJECT

by

Leland J. Winger

Salt Lake City School District

Salt Lake City, Utah

August, 1968

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U. S. Department of
Health, Education, and Welfare

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

ABSTRACT

The Problem. The problem was to test, in a school situation, the ability of the "Otto Self-Concept Improvement Counseling Technique" (OSCICT), when applied to maladjusted under-achievers (dropouts), to improve (1) their self-concept as measured by the California "F" Scale, the Mooney Problem Checklist, and a specially-designed inventory rating sheet, the Winger, and (2) their scholastic ability and achievement as measured by the Iowa Tests of Educational Development and the Lorge-Thorndike mental measurement.

In an attempt to measure the effectiveness of the OSCICT on the employability of the participants, a follow-up was made six months after students left the program.

The OSCICT. The OSCICT, developed by Dr. Herbert A. Otto, Associate Professor, University of Utah, sought by emphasis on personality strengths to achieve more complete realization of an individual's total potentialities. The five major components of the OSCICT are (1) The Multiple Strength Perception Method, (2) the Minerva Experience, (3) Assigned Strength Roles, (4) Action Programs, and, (5) These Are Your Strengths Forms. The OSCICT has been successfully tested in a laboratory environment wherein healthy individuals were used. The purpose, therefore, of this study was to measure the potential and effectiveness of the OSCICT when applied to less healthy students such as those enrolled in the projects.

Populations. The three groups used in this study were drawn from the enrollees of two MDTA Special Youth Projects. The two schools were created by funds made available under the Federal Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, and administered by the Salt Lake City and Ogden

School Districts during the 1966-68 school years. One-half the enrollees in the Salt Lake Project were given the OSCICT and used as the experimental group. The other half were one control group. Students from the Ogden Project were used as a second control group.

Hypotheses. It was hypothesized that the members of the Experimental Group would show improvements by (1) having a lower ending score on the California "F" Scale, (2) by having a lower ending score on the Mooney Problem Checklists, (3) by having a higher ending score on the Winger Behavior Inventory, (4) by having a higher ending score on the Iowa Tests of Educational Development, and,(5) by having higher scores at the end of the training on the Lorge-Thorndike. It was further hypothesized that the effects of the OSCICT would carry over to the world of work.

Findings. It was found that it was meaningless to compare the Experimental Group with the Ogden Group because of so many significant differences at the outset. Likewise, significant differences between the Experimental Group and the Control Group made comparison difficult. Also, it was difficult to measure the Experimental Group as a group because of significant differences at the outset between male and female members.

Hypotheses 1, 2, 3, and 4, were apparently substantiated. While some of the improvements were not statistically significant, the substantiation still seemed defensible for several reasons.

Hypothesis 5 was not substantiated. The results from the six month follow up were inconclusive because there were not sufficient returns of the questionnaires for statistical analysis.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Much appreciation and gratitude are extended to all the faculty and staff members of the Oquirrh Project and in the Ogden Project. Their efforts above and beyond the call of duty in rating each individual student and offering helpful criticism provided the necessary information for the successful completion of this study.

A special commendation goes to Dr. Herbert A. Otto, not only for allowing us the use of his counseling technique, but for his efforts in training and guiding part of our faculty in its use.

A final note of appreciation goes to Dr. Reed M. Merrill who served as a consultant for this study. His comments and directions time and time again helped keep the study in order.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION PAGE

PART I. ORGANIZATION AND DESIGN

CHAPTER I. THE PROBLEM 1

Statement of the Problem 1

Purpose of the Research 1

Significance of the Problem 2

Definitions 3

Delimitations 4

Methodology 5

Class of Inquiry 5

Instrumentation 6

Statistical Design 6

Organizational Design 6

CHAPTER II. RELATED INFORMATION 8

The Manpower Development and Training Act 8

Review of Related Literature 9

CHAPTER III. INSTRUMENTATION 15

Overview of the Otto Self-Concept Improvement Counseling Technique 15

The Multiple Strength Perception Method 16

The Minerva Experience 20

Assigned Strength Roles 22

Action Programs 25

These Are Your Strengths Forms 26

PAGE

Instruments 27

Achievement 28

Potential Ability 28

Social Attitude 29

Personal Problems 29

Personality 29

PART II. THE RESEARCH FINDINGS

CHAPTER IV. REPORT OF RESEARCH 32

Findings 34

Beginning Differences Among Groups 34

Beginning vs. Ending Means Among Groups 42

Comparison of Differences 58

Conclusions 68

PART III. SUMMARY

CHAPTER V. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS 76

Summary 76

Recommendations 78

BIBLIOGRAPHY 80

APPENDIXES 83

Appendix A. Winger Behavior Inventory 84

Appendix B. Pretest Scores 85

VITA 90

PART IV. FOLLOW UP

PAGE

SIX MONTH REPORT 91

  Vocational Training 91

  Population 92

  Planning the Follow Up 95

  Results 95

  Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations 96

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

I. Experimental Group Pretest Scores vs. Ogden Group Pretest Scores 35

II. Experimental Group Pretest Scores vs. Control Group Pretest Scores 36

III. Experimental Group Pretest Male Scores vs. Experimental Group Pretest Female Scores 38

IV. Control Group Pretest Male Scores vs. Control Group Pretest Female Scores 39

V. Ogden Group Pretest Male Scores vs. Ogden Group Pretest Female Scores 40

VI. Experimental Group Pretest Male Scores vs. Control Group Pretest Male Scores 41

VII. Experimental Group Pretest Male Scores vs. Ogden Group Pretest Male Scores 43

VIII. Experimental Group Pretest Female Scores vs. Control Group Pretest Female Scores 44

IX. Experimental Group Pretest Female Scores vs. Ogden Group Pretest Female Scores 45

X. Experimental Group Pretest Scores vs. Experimental Group Posttest Scores 47

XI. Experimental Group Pretest Male Scores vs. Experimental Group Posttest Male Scores 48

TABLE PAGE

XII. Experimental Group Pretest Female Scores vs. Experimental Group Posttest Female Scores 49

XIII. Control Group Pretest Scores vs. Control Group Posttest Scores 50

XIV. Control Group Pretest Male Scores vs. Control Group Posttest Male Scores 51

XV. Control Group Pretest Female Scores vs. Control Group Posttest Female Scores 53

XVI. Ogden Group Pretest Scores vs. Ogden Group Posttest Scores 54

XVII. Ogden Group Pretest Male Scores vs. Ogden Group Posttest Male Scores 55

XVIII. Ogden Group Pretest Female Scores vs. Ogden Group Posttest Female Scores 56

XIX. Total Student Pretest Scores vs. Total Student Posttest Scores 57

XX. Total Group Pretest Male Scores vs. Total Group Posttest Male Scores 59

XXI. Total Group Pretest Female Scores vs. Total Group Posttest Female Scores 60

XXII. Experimental Group Differences vs. Control Group Differences 61

XXIII. Experimental Group Male Differences vs. Control Group Male Differences 63

TABLE PAGE

XXIV. Experimental Group Female Differences vs. Control Group Female Differences 64

XXV. Experimental Group Differences vs. Ogden Group Differences 65

XXVI. Experimental Group Male Differences vs. Ogden Group Male Differences 66

XXVII. Experimental Group Female Differences vs. Ogden Group Female Differences 67

XXVIII. Experimental Group Pretest Scores 86

XXIX. Control Group Pretest Scores 87

XXX. Ogden Group Pretest Scores 88

XXXI. Total Group Pretest Scores 89

XXXII. Population Characteristics of Salt Lake Enrollees 94

PART I

ORGANIZATION AND DESIGN

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

I. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The problem was to test, in a school situation, the ability of the Otto Self-Concept Improvement Counseling Technique (OSCICT, when applied to maladjusted under-achievers (dropouts), to improve

1. their self-concept as measured by the California "F" Scale, the Mooney Problem Checklist, and a specially-designed inventory rating sheet, and
2. their scholastic ability and achievement as measured by the Iowa Tests of Educational Development and the Lorge-Thorndike mental ability measurement.

In an attempt to measure the effectiveness of the OSCICT on the employability of the participants, a follow-up was made six months after students left the program. This is summarized in Part IV of this report.

II. PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH

The OSCICT, developed by Dr. Herbert A. Otto, Associate Professor, University of Utah, sought by emphasis on personality strengths to achieve more complete realization of an individual's total potentialities.

The OSCICT has been tested in a laboratory environment wherein healthy individuals were successfully motivated. The purpose, therefore, of this study was to measure the potential and effectiveness of the OSCICT when applied to less healthy students such as those in the Projects.

III. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PROBLEM

In recent years thousands of adolescents have dropped out of high school. For several reasons they have not been able to survive the traditionally college-oriented secondary schools. If these youth are to become productive citizens instead of wards of the state, they must somehow be prepared for the realities they face in the world of work.

One of the more important tasks in the battle against unemployment is to prepare the youth of the nation to enter the labor force. Scientific achievement is constantly eliminating traditional jobs and creating new ones requiring a greater degree of skill. To obtain the initial job and then be able to change over to new or improved programs, as they are developed, requires initiative and versatility on the part of the worker. Such traits are acquired through education and training. A healthy self-concept is essential.

Proficiency in the basic academic skills of reading, writing, and arithmetic is absolutely necessary in our present society. Logic, therefore, demands the acquisition of these fundamental skills before a person would be expected to master the tasks required of any specific vocation.

The question is, "How do you teach a person that which he has already decided that he either cannot learn or does not want to learn?"

Since most dropouts never learn a profession, a vocationally-oriented program is of particular importance for them, both in terms of interest and necessary preparation. In addition, if the maladjusted under-achiever is to change his behavior and outlook, he must be encouraged to accept a new image of himself and to develop an improved self-concept. This new image and enhanced self-concept must be developed within existing school situations through joint efforts of teachers, counselors, principals, and administrators. The student must be motivated by a revitalized personal initiative and by the desire to meet the enormous challenges of modern technological society. He must be encouraged to see himself as a productive and creative person with the ability to learn, and acquire knowledge and skills in order to be a productive citizen. Only when he has changed his self-concept and self-image from his current constrictive and self-defeating view of himself as a failure and dropout will he be capable of meeting life's challenge of assuming responsibility for his own future.

The successful demonstration of the Otto Self-Concept Improvement Counseling Technique as a better counseling technique in the environment of the maladjusted under-achiever may provide an excellent tool for use anywhere in the United States for the more expedient and effective reclamation of dropouts.

IV. DEFINITIONS

MDTA Special Youth Projects. MDTA Special Youth Projects (called the projects) refers to those schools created by funds made available under the Federal Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, and administered by the Salt Lake City and Ogden School Districts during the 1966-67 school year.

Maladjusted Under-Achiever. The population used in this study was referred to by either the term "maladjusted under-achiever" or "dropout."

As basic qualifications for the projects, these dropouts all functioned academically below the ninth grade level. They had also been unable to adjust to performing all but the most mundane of social obligations. Even earning an honest living was above their capabilities, evidenced by a large percentage of police records and welfare cases among the population. Some of their more obvious habits have been the use of drugs, glue sniffing, and alcoholic beverages.

"Dropout," therefore, was too broad a term to be applied to this population, but was used alternately with the more realistic designation of "maladjusted under-achiever" to mean the same thing.

OSCICT. The Otto Self-Concept Improvement Counseling Technique as used in this study was developed by Dr. Herbert A. Otto, Associate Professor, University of Utah.

Experimental Group. Experimental Group refers to those individuals in the Salt Lake Project who received the OSCICT.

Control Group. Control Group refers to those individuals in the Salt Lake Project who did not receive the OSCICT.

Ogden Group. Ogden Group refers to those individuals in the Ogden Project. They did not receive the OSCICT.

V. DELIMITATIONS

The study had several delimitations:

1. No students were included who were dropped from the Projects before the end of the basic programs.
2. No students were included who did not receive at least twenty weeks of the OSCICT.

3. Some verbal administration of tests in the "before" phase was necessary due to the illiteracy of some students.

VI. METHODOLOGY

Class of Inquiry

The class of inquiry used was the study design. The population that provided data for the study consisted of approximately 100 students enrolled in the MDTA youth projects conducted by both Ogden and Salt Lake City School Districts during the 1966-67 school year.

All students enrolled in the Salt Lake Project were initially divided on the basis of an individual's sex, and then proportionately distributed, by random numbers, into eight homerooms.

Four of these homeroom groups received the OSCICT and four did not. Each group participated in the same curriculum instruction, but were separated one hour each day for homeroom/OSCICT assignments.

After the population was thus distributed, teacher/counselors trained in the OSCICT were assigned to the experimental groups. Regular classroom teachers were assigned to the control groups to teach the traditional homeroom program.

Systematic bias in the assignment of teachers was minimized by the random selection of the teachers to be trained in the OSCICT.

In an attempt to control the Hawthorne effect, a group of approximately twenty students was drawn from the MDTA program in Ogden and used in this study. They did not receive the OSCICT.

Instrumentation

"Before-after" testing was utilized to evaluate the effects of the OSCICT on the students. The first few days of enrollment were devoted to the "before" testing and orientation. Instruments used included the California "F" Scale, the Winger Behavior Inventory, the Mooney Problem Checklist, the verbal and non-verbal forms of the Lorge-Thorndike, and sections of the Iowa Test of Educational Development (ITED).

The posttests were given shortly after the basic program ended, using the same tests, but all in written form.

Statistical Design

Pretest and posttest scores were reduced to means where applicable and statistical analyses applied to ascertain whether significant differences existed.

VII. ORGANIZATIONAL DESIGN

This report is divided into the following chapters:

Part I. Organization and Design

- Chapter I. The Problem (including statement of the problem, purpose, significance, definitions, delimitations, and methodology)
- Chapter II. Related Information (including history of the MDTA and a review of research and related literature)
- Chapter III. Instrumentation (including selection and development of evaluative devices)

Part II. The Research Findings

Chapter IV. Report of Research (including findings and conclusions)

Part III. Summary

Chapter V. Summary and Recommendations

Bibliography

Appendix

Part IV. Follow Up

CHAPTER II

RELATED INFORMATION

I. THE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT

W. Willard Wirtz, Secretary, U. S. Department of Labor, reported in December, 1965, that

> Relentless industrial progress and complex technological advances have resulted in radical changes in our way of life. And since most Americans must begin their pursuit of happiness with the simple fact of a secure job, accommodation to these changes has become a national necessity.
>
> The effects of these changes on employment are well known. There has been a steady decline in the number of jobs for workers with a strong back but an untrained mind, and a rapid rise in the number of jobs requiring perfected skills and advanced education. The postwar "baby-boom" youngsters are crowding into a labor force already overcrowded with inexperienced, unskilled teenagers.[1]

Because of these conditions cited by Secretary Wirtz, the Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA) was passed by Congress in 1962.

Nationwide concern over the deteriorating employment situation for disadvantaged young people prompted amendment of the MDTA in 1963 to provide an expanded youth training program, such as special youth programs designed for disadvantaged out-of-school youth 16 through 21 years of age. (They are limited to youth who come from a severely impoverished environment which has resulted in inadequate educational attainment and work preparation. The young people may also be handicapped by language or cultural difficulties or by hostility, lack of motivation, and other emotional problems which make them unacceptable to employers.)

---

[1] U. S. Department of Labor, in co-operation with the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Manpower Administration Office of Manpower Policy, Evaluation, and Research, Curtis C. Aller, Director (Washington: U. S. Printing Office, 1965) 0-796-857.

Service and training provided in special youth programs include:

1. Continuing counseling, testing, and guidance while the youth is in the special program.
2. Training in basic education and prevocational courses--such as basic work skills and work and social adjustment--and occupational training, in any combination.
3. Job development and other individualized placement services.
4. Followup services, including counseling, as needed to assist the youth in adjusting in employment. Followup services also serve to show how such programs can be improved to better meet the needs of disadvantaged youth.

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Findings from research on the dropout abound in the literature. Barnes described several facets of the dropout as "self-dissatisfaction, repeated failure, suspicion of authority, disruptive home conditions, community antagonisms, and fear of unemployability in the changing economic society of today."[2] Greene reported that the dropout was "more likely to be a boy than a girl."[3] Garbarim found that dropouts tend to marry and have children whom they cannot support.[4] Lichter, Dugan, Giesse, and many others report that usually the dropout has an emotional deficiency.[5,6,7]

---

[2] Regina Barnes, "Ninth Year Language Art Courses for Potential Dropouts," High Points, 46 (June, 1963) p. 62.

[3] Bert I. Greene, "Dropouts and the Elementary School," National Elementary Principals, 42 (November, 1962), p. 53.

Findings from Huber and Matthews indicated that students drop out for many reasons: "Lack of interest in school work, particular teachers responsible,"[8] "social status (or lack of it), academic inadequacy,"[9] etc.

There is no question that the above pretty well describes the dropout. The seriousness of the problem, however, is hinted at by Riendeau when he found that "juvenile delinquency is ten times more frequent among dropouts than among high school graduates,"[10] and Kristan who found that "many dropouts are spending considerable portions of their lives as wards of the state--on relief, in hospitals, or other public institutions."[11]

---

[4] M. Garbarim, "Delinquency, Dropout and Related Problems," Michigan Educational Journal, 40 (January, 1963), p. 349.

[5] Solomon O. Lichter, "Prevention of School Dropouts," School and Society, 90 (April, 1962), p. 160.

[6] Ruth Dugan, "Investigation of the Personal, Social, Educational, and Economical Reasons for Success and Lack of Success in School as Expressed by 105 Tenth Grade Biology Students," Journal of Educational Research, 55 (August, 1962), p. 544.

[7] Richard J. Giesse, "A Closer Look at Dropouts," Texas Outlook, 47 (January, 1963), p. 24.

[8] Mildred Huber, "Profile of a Dropout," California Education, 1 (November, 1963), p. 3.

[9] Charles V. Matthews, "The Serious Problems of the School Dropout," Illinois Education, 50 (January, 1962), p. 209.

[10] Albert J. Riendeau, "Facing Up to the Dropout Problem," Clearing House, 36 (May, 1962), p. 524.

[11] Carl V. Kristan, "Meeting the Needs of School Dropouts," Chicago School Journal, 44 (December, 1962), p. 119.

No price tag can be placed on the human life, but dollars and cents can be placed on the burden to society of a nonproductive citizen.

It is often quoted that the normal, healthy individual is only operating at ten to fifteen per cent of his potential. Hoyt found that the dropout tended to "be even lower, relatively speaking, in academic achievement,"[12] and is thus using even a smaller per cent of his potential.

The challenge, therefore, is to tap or develop as much as possible of these latent capabilities—both from "normal" members of society and from the dropouts.

Otto reports that there is evidence that this problem can be attacked through an interpersonal approach using the medium of small group and employing special methods and instruments developed as a part of his Human Potentialities Research Project at the University of Utah.[13]

Articles have been published in scientific and professional journals describing the work of the HPRP. In this project a number of methods and approaches have been developed and used in programs with selected populations and in laboratory situations by psychiatrists, psychologists and social workers.[14]

---

[12] Kenneth B. Hoyt, "The Counselor and the Dropout," Clearing House, 36 (May, 1962), p. 516.

[13] H. A. Otto, "Human Potentialities Research at the University of Utah," (Salt Lake City: Graduate School of Social Work, University of Utah, 1965), pp. 1, 2, 16-26. (Mimeographed.)

[14] H. A. Otto, "The Personal and Family Strength Research Projects: Some Implications for the Therapist," Mental Hygiene, 48 (July, 1964), pp. 439-450.

Some of the principles, concepts, methods and instruments which have been developed certainly have application to programs dealing with the rehabilitation of dropouts. Methods considered to be especially appropriate are the multiple strenth perception method, action programs, and strength role assignments.[15]

Incorporating these in a holistic approach, and focusing on the potential of the student and building on his strengths, will foster the development of an enhanced self-concept and encourage significant change in the self-image. Once the student feels worthwhile and realizes his true potentials, his mind will be more free to concentrate on academic achievement and the pursuit of a vocation. A brief review of the literature indicates support of these concepts.

In an experiment reported by Videbeck it was brought out ". . . that self-conceptions are learned and that the evaluative reactions of others play a significant part in the learning process."[16]

Staines found evidence that teachers can alter the self-concept of their students by making positive comments to them as well as creating an atmosphere of greater psychological security.[17]

---

[15] H. A. Otto, "Personal and Family Strength Research and Spontaneity Training," Group Psychotherapy, 27 (June-September, 1964), pp. 143-148.

[16] R. Videbeck, "Self-Conceptions and the Reactions of Others," Sociometry, 22 (December, 1960), pp. 351-359.

[17] J. W. Staines, "Self-Picture as a Factor in the Classroom," British Journal of Educational Psychology, 28 (June, 1956), pp. 97-111.

In a cooperative research project Wilber B. Brookover and associates concluded the following: ". . . that self-concept of ability is related to school achievement when measured intelligence is controlled consistently," and that ". . . self-concept of ability is a significant factor affecting the school achievement for boys and tirls in the seventh grade."[18]

While working with adolescents in Salt Lake City to determine their strengths, Healy found the following:

1. The self-concept largely determines the course of action which the individual will take.
2. The strengths of the individual often lie dormant.
3. The adolescent stage of development holds particular promise for the formation of a healthy self-concept and utilization of strengths.
4. Literature is greatly lacking in the area of strength concepts.
5. More research is needed in areas of recognizing and utilizing strength resources.[19]

During the past six years Dr. Herbert A. Otto has researched, developed and initiated a program known as the Human Potentialities Research Project. His basic assumption is that the normal healthy individual functions at approximately ten to fifteen per cent of his potential. Many behavioral scientists such as Fromm,[20] Kubie,[21] Maslow,[22] Mead,[23] Murphy,[24] Rogers,[25] and others, also subscribe to this hypothesis. The implication is then, that man has at his disposal a vast reservoir of mental capabilities as well as physical strength and energy which has consistently been under-estimated.

---

[18] W. B. Brookover, and others, "The Relationship of Self-Image to Achievement in Junior High School Subject," Cooperative Research Project No. 845, (East Lansing, Michigan: Office of Research and Publications, Michigan State University, 1962).

[19] Sandra L. Healy, and H. A. Otto, "Adolescents' Self-Perception of Personality Strengths," Journal of Human Relations, (accepted for publication.)

The application of these new self-concept improvement techniques to a group of maladjusted under-achievers will extend the scope of present research concerning the reclamation of dropouts.

---

[20] E. Fromm, Man For Himself, (New York: Holt, Reinhardt, and Winston, 1962).

[21] L. S. Kubie, "Neurotic Distortion of the Creative Process," Porter Lectures, Series 22, (Lawrence, Kansas: University of Kansas Press, 1958), pp. 122-123.

[22] A. H. Maslow, Motivation and Personality, (New York: Harper & Bros., 1954).

[23] Margaret Mead, "Culture and Personality Development: Human Capacities," Semi-Centennial Lectures, Rice University, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963), pp. 241-254.

[24] G. Murphy, Human Potentialities, (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1961).

[25] C. R. Rogers, On Becoming a Person, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1961).

CHAPTER III

INSTRUMENTATION

Because of the uniqueness of the Otto Self-Concept Improvement Counseling Technique, the first section of this chapter is devoted to an overview of the method, with five sub-sections to emphasize the five major techniques of the OSCICT. Section II of this chapter is devoted to the selection and/or development of the instruments used to measure students for this study.

I. OVERVIEW OF THE OTTO SELF-CONCEPT IMPROVEMENT COUNSELING TECHNIQUE

One of the goals of the Human Potentialities Research Project developed by Dr. Herbert A. Otto was to develop methods designed to help individuals make better use of their personality resources, strengths and assets, and to help them to actualize their potentialities. Beginning in 1960 a number of methods have been developed and field-tested, both in laboratory groups conducted at the University of Utah as well as in various social agency and institutional settings. In the latter case, use of the methods was with patient groups. The most effective of these methods are the Multiple Strength Perception Method, Action Programs, use of Your Strengths forms, Strength Role Assignment, and a recently-discovered method (1964) which shows great promise, the Minerva Experience.

All methods are essentially for use in groups, although Action Programs, These Are Your Strengths forms, Strength Role Assignment, and the Minverva Experience have been used with good effect in individual therapy, counseling and casework.

Dr. Otto has stressed that these methods be used with counseling groups only after there has been a considerable working through of the basic problems and pathology of the group members and when in the therapist's judgment participants are ready to profit optimally from an ego-supportive type of experience. Experience indicates that this is usually sometime beyond the mid-point in the treatment process. Thus, for the purpose of actualizing potential, these methods are best employed

1. only after the group has developed a considerable degree of interpersonal closeness,
2. after members are able to communicate spontaneously and freely about their real concerns,
3. after they are able to share the depth of their feelings, and,
4. after they can use confrontation productively.

The Multiple Strength Perception Method

The Multiple Strength Perception Method is designed for use in groups which focus on the mobilization of human potential and can also be used in group therapy, group counseling and group work, as well as in educational programs which focus on helping a person to "get to know himself better." The method can be of particular value (1) in helping group members gain a clearer understanding and overview of their strengths, personal resources, capacities and potentialities, and (2) in providing an ego-supportive type of experience for members. The following are detailed procedures for use of the method:

1. The M.S.P. Method should be used with non-patient groups only after group members have reached a point where they "really know each other," and after most of any underlying present hostilities which might be present have been worked through.
2. It is of value if the M.S.P. Method is described in detail to the group and the choice left to them whether they wish to use the method or not. This avoids the onus of members feeling that the method was "imposed on them." While describing the method, the voluntary nature of participation is stressed. A blackboard can be used to outline the essential steps of the M.S.P. Method and to write out the Key Questions.
3. It is essential that prior to the use of the method the group work through and recognize on a feeling level that the facing of problems, unrecognized aspects of the self, or blocks to the actualization of unused or latent resources is a prerequisite to helping a person identify and develop strengths and potentialities. The group should also be helped to face the fact that sometimes a (seeming) strength may be symptomatic of a problem or create an impediment to the optimum functioning of a person. Group members should, therefore, be encouraged to feel free also to contribute their percpetions and insight as to what is preventing an individual from making better use of his strengths or resources. However, the group should be helped to recognize that the focus is essentially strength centered. Emphasis is on the use of perceptions and insights

as a means of helping the target person make fuller use of his potentialities.

4. All those wishing to participate in the use of the method are asked to write their names on a slip of paper and to fold this slip. These slips are then placed in a receptacle and the name of the target person is drawn so that selection is essentially random.
5. The target person begins the process by enumerating and sharing aloud what he sees as his strengths. While he is doing this, the group normally does not interrupt or question.
6. When the target person has finished listing what he sees as his strenghts he then turns to the group and asks the group the key question in the following or similar words: "What other strengths do you see me as having, and what (factors or problems) do you see as keeping me from using these strengths?" It should be noted that the group must not begin sharing their perceptions of the target person's strengths (or factors which keep him from making better use of these personality resources) unless the target person first asks the key question. By voicing the key question, the target person in effect issues an invitation and takes responsibility for what transpires during the experience. In addition, there appears to be a greater ego involvement and readiness to accept the perceptions of the group if the target person asks the group for help by addressing to them the key question.

7. The group now "bombards" the target person with its perceptions of his strenghts and factors or forces which keep him from utilizing these strengths. Group members may also address questions to the target person designed to solicit clues about strengths or potentialities or questions designed to explore or clarify possible blocks or impediments to the use of personality resources.
8. The group interaction around the target person usually lasts about forty minutes. When the group leader senses that the group's perceptions of the target person's strengths are running out, he asks the following question: "Are there any other strengths that you see in John (or Mary)?"
9. If no further perceptions are forthcoming, the group leader or therapist asks the following key question: "Now that we have seen the range of some of the strengths and potentialities in John (or Mary), what sort of group fantasy or dream do we have about him (or her); that is, if he (or she) uses all these strengths—how would we see John (or Mary) functioning five years from now?" The group then shares their fantasies and dreams about the target person. Although this is not done routinely, the target person can be asked to share the dream or fantasy he has for himself by using the following or a similar question: "Now John (or Mary) if you used your strengths and potentialities and could do anything you wanted to do, what is your deepest dream or fantasy about

yourself?" Finally, and as a means of closure, the following question can be addressed to the target person: "What sort of feelings did you have when Strength Bombardment was going on?"

The Minerva Experience

This method is named after the Roman goddess, Minerva, goddess of imagination and creativity who sprang fully armored from the head of Jupiter. It will be recalled that one of the contributions from psychoanalysis, and traceable to the early works of Freud, is the hypothesis that every person in the process of growing up undergoes a series of traumatic experiences which are repressed or "forgotten" and which become part of the unconscious. It is one of the tasks of the therapist to help the patient explore his unconscious and to discover and work through these traumatic incidents so that they can be more successfully integrated into the life experience. Psychic energy is thus made available which has formerly been invested in the repression of traumatic material.

In a similar manner, it is Otto's hypothesis that there are in the background of every person, especially during childhood and also throughout life, a web of highly formative positive experiences. This web-work of creative, positive incidents consists of experiences charged with deep emotional meanings called Minverva experiences. These experiences have a great deal to do with the way an individual grows and develops and the network of his strengths and potentialities and are believed to be as important if not more important, than traumatic incidents. The uncovering and recall of Minverva experiences can make psychic energy available through increased self-understanding and by providing clues to strengths and potentialities, some of which may be latent or hidden. Although there are some similarities, the Minerva experience concept differs from Maslow's concept of peak experiences which he defines as follows: "The word peak experience is a generalization for the best moments of the human being, for the happiest moments of life, for experiences of ecstacy, rapture, bliss, of the greatest joy."[1] The essential difference is that Minerva experiences are defined as a network of highly formative and growthful experiences having strongly positive affective components and which play a dominant role in the genesis of personality resources thus significantly affecting personality development. It is Otto's finding that the preponderance of these experiences are not readily accessible to recall; however, uncovering of Minerva experiences provides clues to personality assets and the unfolding of the individual's potentialities. Maslow's research and findings from peak experiences add to and deepen our understanding of Minerva experiences, a more inclusive construct.

To initiate use of the method, Minerva experiences are defined and the method described in detail to the group. The decision whether to use Minerva experience is then made by the total group. When the group reaches a decision to use this method, an assignment is made asking all group members to think about and "go back into their childhood" to uncover such Minerva experiences. It has been found that if an assignment is given to recall these experiences, most group members will in the interim period between sessions make an effort to recall such experiences. This considerably facilitates use of the method.

---

[1] A. H. Maslow, "Fusions of Facts and Values," The American Journal of Psychoanalysis, 23 (February, 1963), pp. 117-131.

During the session following the assignment, a layer removal or "onionskin procedure" is used to foster recall of Minerva experiences. A chart is placed on the blackboard with the top item reading "Age 15 to 18," then "Age 6 to 10," "Age 3 to 6" and "Below 3 years." This chart has been found to be helpful and fosters the process of recall. Participants are urged to let their "mind and memory wander freely and to free associate if needed," and to begin by recalling Minerva experiences at the top of the chart, between ages 15 to 18. They are asked to hold off voicing out loud experiences which they recall from an earlier period. Whenever a participant finishes sharing an experience, the person directing Minerva experiences asks the following questions: "About what age would you place this experience--can you recall anything else about the experience."? and "What other experiences do you recall during this period of your life?" Oftentimes a "trigger phenomenon" can be observed as the sharing of an experience triggers the recall of forgotten incidents in other group members. The group moves down the chart but not rigidly since to maintain spontaneity of sharing it is often best to have a group member share an especially vivid memory even though it falls outside of the age range which the group is exploring.

Assigned Strength Roles

Assigned Strength Roles is essentially a group method but has also been used in individual treatment programs. The method offers participants an opportunity to live a defined role and to engage in specific behavior over a period of time which they believe would strengthen them or which could lead to better utilization of the individual's potential.

In group use the method is first described, and choice whether to use the method is left to the group members. A set of four by five cards is passed around with each card having one strength role typed on it. It is pointed out that the strength roles on the cards are only illustrative and that the group would need to make up a strength role for the person selected. Those wishing to participate then write their names on a piece of paper, and selection is made by random drawing.

Before beginning the process, the person in charge again carefully stresses that the purpose of strength role assignment is not to correct a person's shortcomings, weaknesses or problems by asking him to do something he may not wish to do. The purpose of the method is for everyone to help the person whose name has been drawn to work out a strength role which he will enjoy carrying out, which will strengthen him and which he feels will enable him to make better use of his potential. To initiate the process of strength role assignment, the person whose name has been drawn should turn to the group and ask members the key question in words similar to the following: "What is the role which you think would strengthen me most or do most by helping me to mobilize my potentialities?" It is only after the Key Question has been asked that everyone should begin by contributing their ideas.

Strength roles should be made up and tailored to the specific needs of the person who chooses to participate in strength role assignment, with his wishes a fundamental consideration in the role assignment. He should want to enter into the strength role assignment of his own accord and should be able to enjoy the role. Coercion or forcing a strength role on a person through group pressure should very rarely be attempted and only under special circumstances, as for example, when a person "wants to be persuaded" by the group into accepting a role. Assignment of a strength role is on the basis of group discussion and consensus. Immediately following the assignment specific behaviors associated with the role are spelled out by the group. Notes of these suggestions concerning specific behavior are taken either by or for the person selected. Approximately a week later the person then shares with the group his experience with strength role assignment. The effect of the strength role on those associated with him is examined as well as any growth or change which is taking place in him.

Strength role assignment appears to be of particular value by providing an individual with a broad framework of behavior and actions for "trying out" and developing latent abilities and capacities. There is evidence of a noticeable "carry-over effect" in that both specific behaviors as well as attitudes associated with the behavior continue beyond the period of assignment and into the life experience of the individual, so reports Dr. Otto. In many instances family and associates will recognize changes in behavior and make such as "you are much more creative than you have ever been," and "you are so much more outgoing." Such comments and observations appear to reinforce the behavior and contribute to positive change and increased utilization of potential.

Action Programs

Action Programs are a method which Dr. Otto believes to be useful in both individual and group counseling. It is based on the assumption that the interim period between counseling sessions can be utilized plannedly and systematically in an effort to help the counselee achieve growth. Action programs are defined as any activity, program or interpersonal experience which the participant engages in outside of the counseling setting in order to facilitate the development of strengths or the utilization of his potential. Selection of the type of action prgram to be undertaken is left very largely to the initiative of the counselee. We begin where he is and encourage him to prescribe for himself.

Again, this method is best used after the approximate mid-point of treatment has been passed.

Action Programs initially are of a very simple nature (improvements in grooming, buying a new dress, etc.) and gradually become more complex (building new friendships). Action Programs are usually carried to conclusion in from three to seven days. On completion of an action program, counselees discuss it with the counselor (what undertaking the program has done for them). If the action program has not been completed, blocks or resistences are examined.

When the method is used in a group counseling setting, it is of value to point out that "this is not only a talking group, but an action group." It is stressed that increased utilization of strengths and problem solving abilities does not take place solely as a result of one group meeting a week regardless of the depth of personal exchange or experience which takes place. Group members are urged to immediately become involved in action programs, and are asked to use their best judgment in selecting that action program "which would do most for them."

Successes or failures with action programs are then reported back to the group by the individual members, and evaluation of these programs is constantly undertaken to determine to what extent the individual is helped to develop strengths and encouraged to use potentialities. Where blocks and difficulties in sustaining action programs are encountered, group members are urged to ask the assistence of the total group. The group then brings its sensitivity and perceptivity to bear in an effort to help the individual reach an increased understanding of his difficulties and to help him to remove the obstacle.

By use of action programs, the counseling process is extended into the process of living as the counselee invests himself in purposive action outside of the counseling setting as a means of making therapeutic gains. Dr. Otto believes that professionals are still making too little use of the principle of extending the process of therapy outside of the office door.

These Are Your Strengths Forms

These are your strengths forms is a technique best used when the group has passed the approximate mid-point. The method is designed to provide the patient with a series of positive, ego-supportive experiences. A seconday aim of the method is to mobilize and to enlist aspects of the patient's interpersonal relationship environment in his efforts to regain healthier and more optimal functioning. The very simplicity of this method is deceptive as oftentimes complex forces are set in motion through its use. The method is first described in detail and the choice of whether or not to use the method is left to the group.

The method is briefly as follows: mimeographed forms are used having the following headings, "These Are What I See as Your Personality Strengths and Resources." The remainder of the page is blank. However, the right hand part of the forms contains the word "Name: __________" and under that the word "Date: __________" for use by the individual. The explanation is given that it is the purpose of the method to provide a series of interpersonal experiences of a positive nature designed to give the participant an understanding of how people close to him perceive his strengths and personality assets. It is noted that oftentimes those close to us have a different perspective or clearer idea of our resources because we are too close to ourselves and not accustomed to thinking in terms of our strengths.

The members of the group each fill one out for the target person. Further the group usually has an informal discussion with the person after the forms have been filled out. Objectives of this informal discussion would be to seek clarification or amplification in relation to certain listed strengths, to ask for examples which have led the person filling out the form to the conclusion that the participant has a particular personality resource, etc.

II. INSTRUMENTS

Five facets of the students enrolled in the projects needed to be measured and evaluated: (1) the student's educational achievement, (2) his potential ability, (3) his attitudes, (4) his personal problems, and (5) his personality. This section was divided accordingly into five sections, to discuss each of the five instruments.

Achievement

From the many tests available for measuring academic achievement the Iowa Tests of Education Development (ITED) were chosen. However, only Tests 1, 4, 5, and 9 were used because, based on the curriculum in the two projects, these tests might logically show an improvement.

All students were initially screened with a reading test and all those who were reading at or below the third grade level were given the ITED tests orally. Questions were read twice. When it was observed that a student was marking answers randomly, or was otherwise not motivated to do his best, his score was eliminated from the group results.

Potential Ability

No evaluation of an individual's academic progress is possible without looking at his innate or potential ability, his "IQ." The Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence Test was selected because of its wide range of adaptability. Level F of the test was used for two reasons: (1) it was the most all-inclusive level for grades completed in school, and (2) IQ scores corresponding to the ages of the students could easily be interpreted.

Inasmuch as a fairly large proportion of the students were unable to read above the lower elementary grade levels, both the verbal and the non-verbal forms of the test were administered.

For the posttest, only the verbal form was given. For those students unable to read well, the test questions were read aloud, but kept within the time limit the test provided. Those students who had no particular reading handicap were administered the test according to the directions contained in the manual and also the test booklet.

Social Attitude

Because of its ease in administering to groups, the California "F" Scale was used to measure students in the matter of their social attitudes. The thirty items on this scale were read to those students with reading handicaps.

Personal Problems

Even though the Mooney Problem Checklists are not generally used for the purpose of establishing central tendency and deviations, it seemed that this was the best test available to check with some thoroughness the personal problems of the individual. Some students refused to mark some items and were thus not included in their group totals.

Personality

It was obvious from the first exposure to the students enrolled in the Salt Lake Project that much improvement was needed in terms of dress, cleanliness, manners, and other outward manifestations of the individual.

Upon short acquaintance with the students enrolled in the Project it became equally obvious that there were many personality maladjustments and social maladjustments in virtually every student.

With these variables in mind, the investigator set about to develop an instrument which would measure growth or progress in the areas of personality and social adjustment.

One of the thoughts that occurred was to take "before" and "after" pictures. This turned out to be impractical for several reasons. One, the turnover among students in the early days of the project made it quite difficult to set up photo time. Second, it was noted that many groomed specially for the picture and thus did not reflect a true picture. Also, it was felt that a photograph would not measure the major part of the personality--the social adjustment to the school situation, the other students, and the faculty.

A brainstorming session was held with the faculty and from it came a long list of so-called personality variables which could be used to describe these students. The list included such mundane things as clean fingernails, haircuts, and BO. However, the list was worthwile, but too wieldly to be used.

Thus, the second phase in the development was to categorize the variables suggested into four major classifications: (1) appearance, (2) social behavior, (3) personality, and (4) attitude toward authority. A fifth miscellaneous category was added because there were a few traits which did not fall under any of the major categories.

The list was field tested by faculty members to see which items were redundent, which items were too hard to calculate, and which caused too much disagreement among faculty members, or had varied meanings to different faculty members.

Finally was evolved a personality inventory, titled the Winger Behavior Inventory with which each faculty member rated each student individually, both pretest and posttest. The scores actually assigned to the student were the composite of all the faculty ratings.

PART II

THE RESEARCH FINDINGS

CHAPTER IV

REPORT OF RESEARCH

The purpose of this study was to test, in a school situation, the ability of the OSCICT to improve the students who received it. Two other groups were included in the study with the hope that comparison would make the scores of the experimental group more meaningful. One of these two control groups was located in the same project, which means that the students in it mixed freely with the students in the experimental group and that each had common teachers/counselors. The other control group was located in a similar project in Ogden, staffed by a completely different faculty.

Assuming that the OSCICT would make a difference to those who received it, five hypotheses were formulated:

1. The Experimental Group members would show an improvement in the area of Social Attitude as measured by the California "F" Scale by having a lower ending score than beginning.
2. The Experimental Group members would show an improvement in the area of Personal Problems as measured by the Mooney Problem Checklists by having a lower ending score than beginning.
3. The Experimental Group members would show an improvement in the area of Personality as measured by the Winger Behavior Inventory by having a higher ending score than beginning.

4. The Experimental Group would show an improvement in the area of Achievement as measured by the ITED by having higher ending scores than beginning.
5. The Experimental Group members would show an improvement in the area of Potential Ability as measured by the Lorge-Thorndike by having higher ending scores than beginning.

Inasmuch as two somewhat similar groups were measured for comparison with the Experimental Group, several additional questions were raised:

1. Were the three groups from the same population to begin with on each of the variables measured?
2. Was there a significant difference between the sexes, within and among the groups?
3. Did all groups show improvement?
4. Were the observed improvements (increases or decreases) in the groups statistically significant?

In order to verify or reject the stated hypotheses and to answer the questions raised, the summation of the individual scores in each group, divided by the number of the group, gave us mean scores for each of the three groups used in the study. These mean scores were then compared. The significant findings are reported in the first section of this chapter. There are three sub-sections to deal with the three major groupings of data: (1) Beginning Differences Among Groups, (2) Beginning vs. Ending Means Among Groups, and (3) Comparison of Differences.

At the beginning of each of these sub-sections are several tables denoting means and T-scores between groups. These are followed by a discussion of the items which are statistically significant.

The second section of this chapter is devoted to a discussion of the conclusions reached from the findings.

I. FINDINGS

Beginning Differences Among Groups

An investigation of the data disclosed that there were significant differences among the groups at the outset of the study. These have been carefully divided into several following categories for convenience of the reader.

Table I. Experimental Group Pretest Scores vs. Ogden Group Pretest Scores. It was found that there were many differences between the Experimental Group and the Ogden Group at the outset. The members of the Experimental Group were significantly older than members of the Ogden Group (.01). It was found that the Experimental Group had significantly more problems checked on the four sub-tests of the Mooney—Health and Physical Development (.05), School (.05), Money, Work, the Future (.05), and Boy and Girl Relations (.05). The Mooney total was also significant (.05). As indicated on Table I the Experimental Group pre-test scores were significantly (.001) lower than the Ogden Group on four out of five of the sub-sections of the Winger.

Table II. Experimental Group Pretest Scores vs. Control Group Pretest Scores. The Experimental Group scored significantly (.05) higher than the Control Group on the Lorge-Thorndike. Also, the Experimental Group scored significantly (.05) better than the Control Group on four sections of the Mooney—BC, PG, SC, and Total.

TABLE I

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP PRETEST SCORES VS. OGDEN GROUP PRETEST SCORES

Measurement	T-Value
Iowa Test of Educational Development #1	1.2790
Iowa Test of Educational Development #4	.5896
Iowa Test of Educational Development #5	1.3076
Iowa Test of Educational Development #9	1.9737*
California F	.4481
Mooney—Health and Physical Development	1.7129*
School	1.7081*
Home and Family	.7527
Money, Work, the Future	1.6969*
Boy and Girl Relations	
Relations to People in General	1.0531
Self-centered Concerns	.9715
Total	1.7520*
ITED Total	1.7508*
Lorge-Thorndike	.7759
Winger—Appearance	1.0133
Social Behavior	3.5213***
Personality	4.3627***
Authority	4.5525***
Other	3.7946***
Total	4.1520***

* Significant at .05
** Significant at .01
*** Significant at .001

TABLE II

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP PRETEST SCORES VS. CONTROL GROUP PRETEST SCORES

Measurement	T-Value
Iowa Test of Educational Development #1	.5851
Iowa Test of Educational Development #4	1.4064
Iowa Test of Educational Development #5	.0797
Iowa Test of Educational Development #9	.6331
California F	.1789
Mooney—Health and Physical Development	1.1948
School	1.7551
Home and Family	1.3924
Money, Work, the Future	1.5788
Boy and Girl Relations	2.2881*
Relations to People in General	2.1408*
Self-centered Concerns	1.9619*
Total	2.2700*
ITED Total	.6048
Lorge-Thorndike	2.4125*
Winger—Appearance	1.1045
Social Behavior	.2298
Personality	.0087
Authority	.8770
Other	.6251
Total	.3449

* Significant at .05
** Significant at .01
*** Significant at .001

Table III. Experimental Group Pretest Male Scores vs. Experimental Group Pretest Female Scores. The girls were significantly younger (.05) than the boys. Also, the girls scored higher than the boys on ITED #9 (.01) and ITED Total (.05). The girls were significantly higher on five of the six parts of the Winger—Social Behavior (.05), Personality (.01), Authority (.01), Other (.01), and Total (.01).

Table IV. Control Group Pretest Male Scores vs. Control Group Pretest Female Scores. As indicated on Table IV, there were no significant differences discovered between the girls and the boys of the control group.

Table V. Ogden Group Pretest Male Scores vs. Ogden Group Pretest Female Scores. As indicated on Table V, there were two significant differences uncovered: the girls were significantly older (.01) and they were significantly higher (.05) on ITED #9.

Total Pretest Male Scores vs. Total Pretest Female Scores. Though not directly a part of this study, it was interesting to note that the girls in the total group were significantly higher than the boys in several categories: ITED #9 (.001), ITED Total (.05), Winger Social Behavior (.01), Winger Personality (.01), Winger Authority (.01), Winger Other (.01), and Winger Total (.01).

Table VI. Experimental Group Pretest Male Scores vs. Control Group Pretest Male Scores. As indicated on Table VI, no significant differences were uncovered between the Experimental Group Male members and the Control Group Male members.

TABLE III

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP PRETEST MALE SCORES VS. EXPERIMENTAL GROUP PRETEST FEMALE SCORES

Measurement	T-Value
Iowa Test of Educational Development #1	1.9387
Iowa Test of Educational Development #4	1.9907
Iowa Test of Educational Development #5	1.4147
Iowa Test of Educational Development #9	2.9452**
California F	.9946
Mooney—Health and Physical Development	.8842
School	.4205
Home and Family	1.2971
Money, Work, the Future	.3790
Boy and Girl Relations	.4082
Relations to People in General	.6138
Self-centered Concerns	1.1767
Total	.7408
ITED Total	2.6345*
Winger—Appearance	1.1224
Social Behavior	2.2206*
Personality	2.7451**
Authority	3.2499**
Other	3.0425**
Total	2.9314**

* Significant at .05
** Significant at .01
*** Significant at .001

TABLE IV

CONTROL GROUP PRETEST MALE SCORES VS. CONTROL GROUP PRETEST FEMALE SCORES

Measurement	T-Value
Iowa Test of Educational Development #1	.0386
Iowa Test of Educational Development #4	.6535
Iowa Test of Educational Development #5	1.7591
Iowa Test of Educational Development #9	1.4748
California F	1.7514
Mooney--Health and Physical Development	.8707
School	.1065
Home and Family	.0465
Money, Work, the Future	.6584
Boy and Girl Relations	.2422
Relations to People in General	.7746
Self-centered Concerns	.6410
Total	.2897
ITED Total	.9718
Lorge-Thorndike	.6596
Winger--Appearance	.4759
Social Behavior	.5624
Personality	.5281
Authority	.8281
Other	.5850
Total	.5102

* Significant at .05
** Significant at .01
*** Significant at .001

TABLE V

OGDEN GROUP PRETEST MALE SCORES VS. OGDEN GROUP PRETEST FEMALE SCORES

Measurement	T-Value
Iowa Test of Educational Development #1	.7571
Iowa Test of Educational Development #4	.3657
Iowa Test of Educational Development #5	.5160
Iowa Test of Educational Development #9	2.3503*
California F	.5141
Mooney—Health and Physical Development	.2217
School	.0826
Home and Family	.8790
Money, Work, the Future	.2917
Boy and Girl Relations	.4482
Relations to People in General	.4818
Self-centered Concerns	.0516
Total	.1640
ITED Total	.2406
Lorge-Thorndike	.2115
Winger—Appearance	1.2144
Social Behavior	1.2309
Personality	.9023
Authority	1.5105
Other	1.0990
Total	1.3705

* Significant at .05
** Significant at .01
*** Significant at .001

TABLE VI

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP PRETEST MALE SCORES VS. CONTROL GROUP PRETEST MALE SCORES

Measurement	T-Value
Iowa Test of Educational Development #1	.1694
Iowa Test of Educational Development #4	.0594
Iowa Test of Educational Development #5	.2501
Iowa Test of Educational Development #9	.0444
California F	1.4763
Mooney--Health and Physical Development	.9454
School	1.2244
Home and Family	.5709
Money, Work, the Future	.9705
Boy and Girl Relations	1.5212
Relations to People in General	1.6554
Self-centered Concenrs	1.3169
Total	1.5402
ITED Total	.0278
Lorge-Thorndike	1.4000
Winger--Appearance	1.1488
Social Behavior	.4892
Personality	.7638
Authority	.1072
Other	.3933
Total	.6467

* Significant at .05
** Significant at .01
*** Significant at .001

Table VII. Experimental Group Pretest Male Scores vs. Ogden Group Pretest Male Scores. It was found that the male members of the Ogden Group were significantly younger (.01) than the male members of the Experimental Group. As indicated on Table VII, the male members of the Ogden Group were significantly higher (.05) on the ITED Total, the Winger Social Behavior (.05), the Winger Personality (.01), the Winger Authority (.01), the Winger Other (.01), and the Winger Total (.01).

Table VIII. Experimental Group Pretest Female Scores vs. Control Group Pretest Female Scores. As indicated on Table VIII, only one significant (.05) difference was discovered. The Experimental Group female members were higher on the Lorge-Thorndike than were the female members of the Control Group.

Table IX. Experimental Group Pretest Female Scores vs. Ogden Group Pretest Female Scores. As indicated on Table IX, the Ogden Group female members were significantly higher than the Experimental Group female members on two measures: (1) Winger Authority (.01), and (2) the Winger Total (.05).

Beginning vs. Ending Means Among Groups

The beginning and ending scores of each of the three groups was analyzed for significant increases or decreases. Each group was further sub-divided into the male and female members for analysis. Total scores, though not a part of this study, were also compared.

TABLE VII

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP PRETEST MALE SCORES VS. OGDEN GROUP PRETEST MALE SCORES

Measurement	T-Value
Iowa Test of Educational Development #1	1.9664
Iowa Test of Educational Development #4	1.2903
Iowa Test of Educational Development #5	1.8975
Iowa Test of Educational Development #9	.9376
California F	.3557
Mooney--Health and Physical Development	.8088
School	1.0605
Home and Family	.6703
Money, Work, the Future	1.0736
Boy and Girl Relations	1.0638
Relations to People in General	.7819
Self-centered Concerns	.3286
Total	1.0476
ITED Total	2.0402*
Winger--Appearance	.2265
Social Behavior	2.4571*
Personality	3.6567**
Authority	2.9993**
Other	3.3855**
Total	3.1990**

* Significant at .05
** Significant at .01
*** Significant at .001

TABLE VIII

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP PRETEST FEMALE SCORES VS. CONTROL GROUP PRETEST FEMALE SCORES

Measurement	T-Value
Iowa Test of Educational Development #1	1.2019
Iowa Test of Educational Development #4	2.0401
Iowa Test of Educational Development #5	.1834
Iowa Test of Educational Development #9	1.4079
California F	1.1648
Mooney--Health and Physical Development	.8404
School	1.3050
Home and Family	1.5433
Money, Work, the Future	1.4552
Boy and Girl Relations	1.7645
Relations to People in General	1.3987
Self-centered Concerns	1.5991
Total	1.8072
ITED Total	1.0524
Lorge-Thorndike	2.4859*
Winger--Appearance	.2200
Social Behavior	1.0821
Personality	1.1172
Authority	1.7358
Other	1.5818
Total	1.4549

* Significant at .05
** Significant at .01
*** Significant at .001

TABLE IX

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP PRETEST FEMALE SCORES VS. OGDEN GROUP PRETEST FEMALE SCORES

Measurement	T-Value
Iowa Test of Educational Development #1	.5954
Iowa Test of Educational Development #4	.8006
Iowa Test of Educational Development #5	.1510
Iowa Test of Educational Development #9	1.1392
California F	.8651
Mooney--Health and Physical Development	1.8349
School	1.4540
Home and Family	.7608
Money, Work, the Future	1.2307
Boy and Girl Relations	1.8146
Relations to People in General	.8597
Self-centered Concerns	1.3915
Total	1.6221
ITED Total	.0539
Lorge-Thorndike	1.8125
Winger--Appearance	.8286
Social Behavior	1.9518
Personality	1.9991
Authority	3.2549**
Other	1.5184
Total	2.1240*

* Significant at .05
** Significant at .01
*** Significant at .001

Table X. Experimental Group Pretest Scores vs. Experimental Group Posttest Scores. As indicated on Table X, four of the Winger measurements showed some highly significant (.001) improvements: Appearance, Social Behavior, Personality, and Total. One other Winger score, the "Other," showed a significant improvement (.01).

Table XI. Experimental Group Pretest Male Scores vs. Experimental Group Posttest Male Scores. As indicated on Table XI, the male members of the Experimental Group showed several significant improvements on the Winger: Appearance (.01), Social Behavior (.01), Personality (.001), Authority (.05), and Total (.001).

Table XII. Experimental Group Pretest Female Scores vs. Experimental Group Posttest Female Scores. As indicated on Table XII, the Experimental Group female members showed significant improvements on parts of the Winger: Appearance (.05), Social Behavior (.01), Personality (.05), and Total (.05).

Table XIII. Control Group Pretest Scores vs. Control Group Posttest Scores. As indicated on Table XIII, the Control Group improved significantly (.05) on ITED #4. They also improved on all of the Winger measurements: Appearance (.05), Social Behavior (.01), Personality (.05), Authority (.05), Other (.05), and Total (.01).

Table XIV. Control Group Pretest Male Scores vs. Control Group Posttest Male Scores. As indicated on Table XIV, the Control Group male members showed a significant improvement on three parts of the Winger: Appearance (.05), Social Behavior (.01), and Total (.05).

TABLE X

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP PRETEST SCORES VS. EXPERIMENTAL GROUP POSTTEST SCORES

Measurement	T-Value
Iowa Test of Educational Development #1	.9683
Iowa Test of Educational Development #4	1.3972
Iowa Test of Educational Development #5	1.5224
Iowa Test of Educational Development #9	.7531
California F	.6113
Mooney--Health and Physical Development	.8867
School	.2831
Home and Family	1.0059
Money, Work, the Future	.6157
Boy and Girl Relations	.6963
Relations to People in General	.6007
Self-centered Concerns	.4339
Total	.8331
ITED Total	1.3381
Lorge-Thorndike	.2994
Winger--Appearance	3.1715***
Social Behavior	3.5655***
Personality	3.4877***
Authority	2.4532**
Other	1.5040
Total	3.4370***

* Significant at .05
** Significant at .01
*** Significant at .001

TABLE XI

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP PRETEST MALE SCORES VS. EXPERIMENTAL GROUP POSTTEST MALE SCORES

Measurement	T-Value
Iowa Test of Educational Development #1	.5872
Iowa Test of Educational Development #4	1.5520
Iowa Test of Educational Development #5	.8987
Iowa Test of Educational Development #9	.2479
California F	.0638
Mooney—Health and Physical Development	.4008
School	.2487
Home and Family	.2075
Money, Work, the Future	.0824
Boy and Girl Relations	.1378
Relations to People in General	.0577
Self-centered Concerns	.1623
Total	.2148
ITED Total	.8900
Lorge-Thorndike	.5875
Winger—Appearance	2.5515**
Social Behavior	2.8404**
Personality	3.0973***
Authority	2.2889*
Other	1.4247
Total	3.1311***

* Significant at .05
** Significant at .01
*** Significant at .001

TABLE XII

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP PRETEST FEMALE SCORES VS. EXPERIMENTAL GROUP POSTTEST FEMALE SCORES

Measurement	T-Value
Iowa Test of Educational Development #1	.9845
Iowa Test of Educational Development #4	.4533
Iowa Test of Educational Development #5	1.3377
Iowa Test of Educational Development #9	1.1076
California F	.8629
Mooney—Health and Physical Development	.9282
School	.8676
Home and Family	1.2755
Money, Work, the Future	1.2517
Boy and Girl Relations	1.0488
Relations to People in General	.9962
Self-centered Concerns	.9873
Total	1.1545
ITED Total	1.1853
Lorge-Thorndike	.2818
Winger—Appearance	1.9441*
Social Behavior	2.8763**
Personality	2.4328*
Authority	1.4937
Other	.9560
Total	2.3847*

* Significant at .05
** Significant at .01
*** Significant at .001

TABLE XIII

CONTROL GROUP PRETEST SCORES VS. CONTROL GROUP POSTTEST SCORES

Measurement	T-Value
Iowa Test of Educational Development #1	.7674
Iowa Test of Educational Development #4	1.9660*
Iowa Test of Educational Development #5	.1818
Iowa Test of Educational Development #9	1.2989
California F	.2021
Mooney—Health and Physical Development	.3203
School	.6413
Home and Family	.5932
Money, Work, the Future	1.1399
Boy and Girl Relations	1.2653
Relations to People in General	.0303
Self-centered Concerns	.6470
Total	.8951
ITED Total	1.0248
Lorge-Thorndike	.5667
Winger—Appearance	2.1803*
Social Behavior	2.7274**
Personality	2.2208*
Authority	1.9850*
Other	1.9504*
Total	2.8478**

* Significant at .05
** Significant at .01
*** Significant at .001

TABLE XIV

CONTROL GROUP PRETEST MALE SCORES VS. CONTROL GROUP POSTTEST MALE SCORES

Measurement	T-Value
Iowa Test of Educational Development #1	.0382
Iowa Test of Educational Development #4	1.3223
Iowa Test of Educational Development #5	.5032
Iowa Test of Educational Development #9	1.0364
California F	1.1517
Mooney--Health and Physical Development	.4677
School	.4968
Home and Family	1.2160
Money, Work, the Future	1.2011
Boy and Girl Relations	1.1599
Relations to People in General	.1638
Self-centered Concerns	.5842
Total	1.0445
ITED Total	.6573
Lorge-Thorndike	.1142
Winger--Appearance	1.7724*
Social Behavior	2.5880**
Personality	1.2495
Authority	1.2057
Other	.9651
Total	1.9656*

* Significant at .05
** Significant at .01
*** Significant at .001

Table XV. Control Group Pretest Female Scores vs. Control Group Posttest Female Scores. As indicated on Table XV, the female members of the Control Group showed several significant improvements on the Winger: Personality (.05), Authority (.05), Other (.05), and Total (.05).

Table XVI. Ogden Group Pretest Scores vs. Ogden Group Posttest Scores. As indicated on Table XVI, the Ogden Group demonstrated a significant improvement on several parts of the Mooney: HF (.05), MWF (.01), BC (.05), SC (.05), and Total (.01). Also, they showed improvement on three parts of the Winger: Appearance (.05), Social Behavior (.05), and Personality (.05).

Table XVII. Ogden Group Pretest Male Scores vs. Ogden Group Posttest Male Scores. As indicated on Table XVII, only one significant improvements was noted among the Ogden Group male members—the Winger Appearance (.05).

Table XVIII. Ogden Group Pretest Female Scores vs. Ogden Group Posttest Female Scores. As indicated on Table XVIII, the Ogden Group female members improved significantly on six of the eight sections of the Mooney: S (.01), HF (.05), MWF (.05), BC (.05), SC (.05), and Total (.05).

Table XIX. Total Student Pretest Scores vs. Total Student Posttest Scores. As indicated on Table XIX, the total group—experimental, control, and Ogden—used in the study demonstrated several significant improvements: ITED #4 (.05), ITED Total (.05), Mooney HF (.05), Mooney

TABLE XV

CONTROL GROUP PRETEST FEMALE SCORES VS. CONTROL GROUP POSTTEST FEMALE SCORES

Measurement	T-Value
Iowa Test of Educational Development #1	1.2994
Iowa Test of Educational Development #4	1.4756
Iowa Test of Educational Development #5	.4128
Iowa Test of Educational Development #9	.8101
California F	1.1570
Mooney--Health and Physical Development	.0440
School	.3899
Home and Family	.3970
Money, Work, the Future	.1290
Boy and Girl Relations	.4922
Relations to People in General	.2237
Self-centered Concerns	.3173
Total	.0986
ITED Total	.8415
Lorge-Thorndike	.9638
Winger--Appearance	1.2477
Social Behavior	1.3160
Personality	2.0657*
Authority	1.7344*
Other	1.9834*
Total	2.0770*

* Significant at .05
** Significant at .01
*** Significant at .001

TABLE XVI

OGDEN GROUP PRETEST SCORES VS. OGDEN GROUP POSTTEST SCORES

Measurement	T-Value
Iowa Test of Educational Development #1	1.1372
Iowa Test of Educational Development #4	.6068
Iowa Test of Educational Development #5	.4814
Iowa Test of Educational Development #9	.5431
California F	.2221
Mooney—Health and Physical Development	1.5410
School	1.5895
Home and Family	2.0863*
Money, Work, the Future	2.7655**
Boy and Girl Relations	2.0831*
Relations to People in General	1.6273
Self-centered Concerns	2.1980*
Total	2.6087**
ITED Total	.9510
Lorge-Thorndike	.9651
Winger—Appearance	2.0850*
Social Behavior	1.7794*
Personality	1.7092*
Authority	.1496
Other	.7579
Total	1.6233

* Significant at .05
** Significant at .01
*** Significant at .001

TABLE XVII

OGDEN GROUP PRETEST MALE SCORES VS. OGDEN GROUP POSTTEST MALE SCORES

Measurement	T-Value
Iowa Test of Educational Development #1	.6957
Iowa Test of Educational Development #4	.4956
Iowa Test of Educational Development #5	.0409
Iowa Test of Educational Development #9	.7011
California F	.5445
Mooney—Health and Physical Development	.7059
School	.4648
Home and Family	1.4363
Money, Work, the Future	1.6448
Boy and Girl Relations	.9956
Relations to People in General	1.0558
Self-centered Concerns	1.3566
Total	1.3811
ITED Total	.5517
Lorge-Thorndike	1.3757
Winger—Appearance	2.0876*
Social Behavior	1.1998
Personality	1.6156
Authority	.1843
Other	.9972
Total	1.3783

* Significant at .05
** Significant at .01
*** Significant at .001

TABLE XVIII

OGDEN GROUP PRETEST FEMALE SCORES VS. OGDEN GROUP POSTTEST FEMALE SCORES

Measurement	T-Value
Iowa Test of Educational Development #1	1.0708
Iowa Test of Educational Development #4	.4512
Iowa Test of Educational Development #5	.9091
Iowa Test of Educational Development #9	.1761
California F	.5459
Mooney--Health and Physical Development	1.3011
School	2.9198**
Home and Family	1.7142*
Money, Work, the Future	2.3864*
Boy and Girl Relations	2.1998*
Relations to People in General	1.2758
Self-centered Concerns	1.9471*
Total	2.3323*
ITED Total	.7555
Lorge-Thorndike	.1784
Winger--Appearance	.8273
Social Behavior	1.0866
Personality	.7618
Authority	.4174
Other	.1187
Total	.6993

* Significant at .05
** Significant at .01
*** Significant at .001

TABLE XIX

TOTAL STUDENT PRETEST SCORES VS. TOTAL STUDENT POSTTEST SCORES

Measurement	T-Value
Iowa Test of Educational Development #1	1.6160
Iowa Test of Educational Development #4	2.2641*
Iowa Test of Educational Development #5	1.3395
Iowa Test of Educational Development #9	1.4346
California F	.6315
Mooney—Health and Physical Development	1.2923
School	1.0392
Home and Family	1.8482*
Money, Work, the Future	1.9533*
Boy and Girl Relations	1.5858
Relations to People in General	1.0466
Self-centered Concerns	1.3942
Total	1.8675*
ITED Total	1.9019*
Winger—Appearance	4.3471***
Social Behavior	4.3553***
Personality	3.9479***
Authority	2.5166**
Other	2.2586*
Total	4.1760***

* Significant at .05
** Significant at .01
*** Significant at .001

MWF (.05), Mooney Total (.05), Winger Appearance (.001), Winger Social Behavior (.001), Winger Personality (.001), Winger Authority (.01), Winger Other (.05), and Winger Total (.001).

Table XX. Total Group Pretest Male Scores vs. Total Group Posttest Male Scores. As indicated on Table XX, the total boys improved on ITED #4 (.05) and five parts of the Winger: Appearance (.001), Social Behavior (.001), Personality (.01), Authority (.05), and Total (.001).

Table XXI. Total Group Pretest Female Scores vs. Total Group Posttest Female Scores. As indicated on Table XXI, the total girls demonstrated significant improvement on the ITED #1 (.05), the Mooney MWF (.05), the Mooney Total (,05), and all six parts of the Winger: Appearance (.05), Social Behavior (.01), Personality (.01), Authority (.05), Other (.05), and Total (.01).

Comparison of Differences (Change Scores)

The final category into which the data were analyzed was to compare all groups and sub-groups to see whether the improvements were statistically significant when compared to each other.

Table XXII. Experimental Group Differences vs. Control Group Differences. As indicated on Table XXII, no significant differences were demonstrated between the improvements of the Experimental Group and the improvements of the Control Group.

TABLE XX

TOTAL GROUP PRETEST MALE SCORES VS. TOTAL GROUP POSTTEST MALE SCORES

Measurement	T-Value
Iowa Test of Educational Development #1	.5381
Iowa Test of Educational Development #4	1.9135*
Iowa Test of Educational Development #5	.7076
Iowa Test of Educational Development #9	.9550
California F	.5505
Mooney--Health and Physical Development	.7423
School	.1676
Home and Family	1.1031
Money, Work, the Future	1.1875
Boy and Girl Relations	.7858
Relations to People in General	.3586
Self-centered Concerns	.5968
Total	1.0348
ITED Total	1.0845
Lorge-Thorndike	.0900
Winger--Appearance	3.6991***
Social Behavior	3.5619***
Personality	2.8418**
Authority	1.9180*
Other	1.5729
Total	3.2998***

* Significant at .05
** Significant at .01
*** Significant at .001

TABLE XXI

TOTAL GROUP PRETEST FEMALE SCORES VS. TOTAL GROUP POST-TEST FEMALE SCORES

Measurement	T-Value
Iowa Test of Educational Development #1	1.9815*
Iowa Test of Educational Development #4	1.2089
Iowa Test of Educational Development #5	1.1562
Iowa Test of Educational Development #9	1.0624
California F	.3096
Mooney--Health and Physical Development	1.1358
School	1.5996
Home and Family	1.5594
Money, Work, the Future	1.9085*
Boy and Girl Relations	1.6446
Relations to People in General	1.2738
Self-centered Concerns	1.5440
Total	1.7556*
ITED Total	1.6457
Lorge-Thorndike	.6622
Winger--Appearance	2.3513*
Social Behavior	2.7269**
Personality	2.9305**
Authority	1.7203*
Other	1.6811*
Total	2.8286**

* Significant at .05
** Significant at .01
*** Significant at .001

TABLE XXII

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP DIFFERENCES VS. CONTROL GROUP DIFFERENCES

Measurement	T-Value
Iowa Test of Educational Development #1	.0299
Iowa Test of Educational Development #4	.2913
Iowa Test of Educational Development #5	1.6342
Iowa Test of Educational Development #9	.4555
California F	.9708
Mooney—Health and Physical Development	.3328
School	.6176
Home and Family	.3186
Money, Work, the Future	.7867
Boy and Girl Relations	.5297
Relations to People in General	.0385
Self-centered Concerns	1.0805
Total	.1135
ITED Total	.5692
Lorge-Thorndike	.1820
Winger—Appearance	1.4248
Social Behavior	.8900
Personality	1.3191
Authority	.2318
Other	.5444
Total	.6987

* Significant at .05
** Significant at .01
*** Significant at .001

Table XXIII. Experimental Group Male Differences vs. Control Group Male Differences. As indicated on Table XXIII, no significant differences were found between the improvements of the Experimental Group male members and the Control Group male members.

Table XXIV. Experimental Group Female Differences vs. Control Group Female Differences. As indicated on Table XXIV, only significant difference was found between the Experimental Group female members and the Control Group female members: ITED #5 (.01).

Table XXV. Experimental Group Differences vs. Ogden Group Differences. As indicated on Table XXV, two significant differences were found between the change scores of the Experimental Group members and the Ogden Group members. The Ogden Group improved significantly (.05) moreso than the Experimental Group on the Mooney MWF. Just the reverse was true on the Winger Authority (.05) where the Experimental Group improved significantly moreso than the Ogden Group.

Table XXVI. Experimental Group Male Differences vs. Ogden Group Male Differences. As indicated on Table XXVI, no significant differences were found between the improvements of the Experimental Group male members and the Ogden Group male members.

Table XXVII. Experimental Group Female Differences vs. Ogden Group Female Differences. As indicated on Table XXVII, the Experimental Group female members improved significantly moreso than the Ogden Group female members on the Winger Authority (.05) and the Winger Total (.05).

TABLE XXIII

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP MALE DIFFERENCES VS. CONTROL GROUP MALE DIFFERENCES

Measurement	T-Value
Iowa Test of Educational Development #1	.7752
Iowa Test of Educational Development #4	.3091
Iowa Test of Educational Development #5	.0541
Iowa Test of Educational Development #9	.7535
California F	.5983
Mooney--Health and Physical Development	1.5295
School	.0349
Home and Family	.2817
Money, Work, the Future	.2960
Boy and Girl Relations	1.0077
Relations to People in General	.2508
Self-centered Concerns	.5023
Total	.3807
ITED Total	.0990
Winger--Appearance	.7441
Social Behavior	.0821
Personality	1.2763
Authority	.3885
Other	.0236
Total	.7910

* Significant at .05
** Significant at .01
*** Significant at .001

TABLE XXIV

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FEMALE DIFFERENCES VS. CONTROL GROUP FEMALE DIFFERENCES

Measurement	T-Value
Iowa Test of Educational Development #1	.6911
Iowa Test of Educational Development #4	1.2397
Iowa Test of Educational Development #5	3.3686*
Iowa Test of Educational Development #9	.4615
California F	.7255
Mooney—Health and Physical Development	1.6832
School	.8143
Home and Family	.1527
Money, Work, the Future	1.6679
Boy and Girl Relations	.6054
Relations to People in General	.3449
Self-centered Concerns	1.0982
Total	.3170
ITED Total	1.1803
Lorge-Thorndike	1.1755
Winger—Appearance	1.4260
Social Behavior	1.4194
Personality	.7623
Authority	.8496
Other	.6774
Total	.3500

* Significant at .05
** Significant at .01
*** Significant at .001

TABLE XXV

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP DIFFERENCES VS. OGDEN GROUP DIFFERENCES

Measurement	T-Value
Iowa Test of Educational Development #1	.7312
Iowa Test of Educational Development #4	.4834
Iowa Test of Educational Development #5	.9543
Iowa Test of Educational Development #9	.0653
California F	1.4417
Mooney—Health and Physical Development	.2863
School	.4355
Home and Family	1.5455
Money, Work, the Future	1.0144
Boy and Girl Relations	2.0002*
Relations to People in General	.7279
Self-centered Concerns	1.0410
Total	1.7765
ITED Total	.2103
Lorge-Thorndike	1.7279
Winger--Appearance	.2331
Social Behavior	.8404
Personality	1.1282
Authority	2.6289*
Other	.6420
Total	1.3391

* Significant at .05
** Significant at .01
*** Significant at .001

TABLE XXVI

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP MALE DIFFERENCES VS. OGDEN GROUP MALE DIFFERENCES

Measurement	T-Value
Iowa Test of Educational Development #1	.7154
Iowa Test of Educational Development #4	.7308
Iowa Test of Educational Development #5	.8399
Iowa Test of Educational Development #9	.1996
California F	1.5779
Mooney—Health and Physical Development	.1154
School	.8331
Home and Family	.5611
Money, Work, the Future	.5395
Boy and Girl Relations	1.6355
Relations to People in General	.7314
Self-centered Concerns	.6898
Total	1.7260
ITED Total	.1157
Lorge-Thorndike	1.3531
Winger—Appearance	1.9926
Social Behavior	.1716
Personality	.1487
Authority	.9413
Other	.6737
Total	.3577

* Significant at .05
** Significant at .01
*** Significant at .001

TABLE XXVII

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FEMALE DIFFERENCES VS. OGDEN GROUP FEMALE DIFFERENCES

Measurement	T-Value
Iowa Test of Educational Development #1	.2198
Iowa Test of Educational Development #4	.2342
Iowa Test of Educational Development #5	1.1653
Iowa Test of Educational Development #9	.6435
California F	.3399
Mooney--Health and Physical Development	.5974
School	.2357
Home and Family	1.4599
Money, Work, the Future	.6339
Boy and Girl Relations	.9943
Relations to People in General	.2979
Self-centered Concerns	.6432
Total	.5963
ITED Total	.5243
Lorge-Thorndike	.8406
Winger--Appearance	1.6711
Social Behavior	2.0308
Personality	1.6430
Authority	2.5149*
Other	1.3951
Total	2.3033*

* Significant at .05
** Significant at .01
*** Significant at .001

II. CONCLUSIONS

In addition to the five hypotheses raised, there were compounding questions (See Page 33) because of the use of two other groups against whom the study group was measured. Therefore, it seemed logical to divide the conclusions into five major sections--one for each of the five hypotheses, and then to discuss them in reference to the four questions.

Hypothesis #1. The Experimental Group members would show an improvement in the area of Social Attitude as measured by the California "F" Scale by having a lower ending score than beginning.

The pretest scores indicated that while the Experimental Group was significantly different from a normal population, it did not differ significantly from the members in either the Control Group or the Ogden Group.

Conclusion #1. Members of all three groups were apparently extremely biased and opinionated.

This could reflect a lack of education, effects of a low socio-economic conditions, high rate of delinquency (approximately 60 per cent in the Experimental Group), or any number of conditions outside the realm of this study. Further study is recommended.

All three groups showed improvement by having lower scores on the posttests. When further divided into male and female, all groups still showed improvement. None of the improvements, however, were significant.

Conclusion #2. Hypothesis #1 was substantiated. The Group did indeed improve, even though not to the degree of significance usually held to eliminate chance.

Hypothesis #2. The Experimental Group members would show an improvement in the area of Personal Problems as measured by the Mooney Problem Checklists by having a lower ending score than beginning.

The Mooney has 210 items, 30 in each of the following areas:

1. Health and Physical Development (HPD)
2. School (S)
3. Home and Family (HF)
4. Money, Work, the Future (MWF)
5. Boy and Girl Relations (BG)
6. Relations to People in General (PG)
7. Self-centered Concerns (SC)

Also, there is a Mooney total score.

The pretest scores indicated that only one significant difference exited between the Experimental and Ogden Groups, the Experimental Group was significantly higher than the Ogden Group on one of the Mooney items: BG (.05).

The Experimental Group females were significantly younger than the Experimental Group males, while the Ogden females were significantly older than the Ogden males.

Conclusion #1. Significant differences in ages account for the beginning difference in Boy and Girl Relations (BG).

The pretest scores indicated that the Experimental Group was significantly higher than the Control Group in four of the Mooney items: BG, PG, SC, and the Total.

Conclusion #2. Comparing improvement in Social Attitude as measured by the Mooney was meaningless simply because the pretest scores indicate *that the Experimental Group and the Control Group are distinctly two different populations on this variable.*

When comparing beginning vs. ending scores it was found that the Ogden Group made significant improvements in most areas of the Mooney while the Experimental Group and the Control Group made none. A closer investigation uncovered the fact that the Ogden males made no significant improvement, which means it was the weight of the Ogden Group female improvement which affected the total group.

Conclusion #3. *Comparison between the Experimental Group and the Control Group on the Mooney was meaningless because of the significant difference in the ages of the girls, which in turn allowed the older girls to score better in the seven areas.*

When analyzing the significance of the differences between beginning and ending scores among groups and sub-groups only one was significant. The Ogden Group improved significantly moreso than the Experimental Group. This once again can be traced to the difference in ages of the girls which biased the total scores and made comparison meaningless.

One further observation must be made. While both the Experimental Group and the Ogden Group improved in all areas of the Mooney, the Control Group did not.

Conclusion #4. *Where it was demonstrated that the improvement of the Ogden Group was attributable to female maturation, the improvement of the Experimental Group in the same setting with the Control Group* (which was also a more similar group) *may be attributed to the OSCICT, even though the improvements approached, but did not reach, significance.*

Conclusion #5. Hypothesis #2 was substantiated.

The improvements were not statistically significant; however, the investigator believed they should be investigated further as it was suspected that students actually did improve significantly, but that they were more willing to indicate personal problems on the posttest than they were on the pretest.

Hypothesis #3. The Experimentsl Group members would show an improvement in the area of Personality as measured by the Winger Behavior Inventory by having a higher ending score than beginning.

The pretest scores indicated that members of the Experimental Group and members of the Control Group were similar. When members of the Experimental Group were compared with members of the Ogden Group it was immediately shown that there was a highly significant difference (.001) on five of the six categories of the Winger. By comparing the Experimental Group male members with the Ogden Group male members, and the Experimental Group femal members with the Ogden Group female members, significant differences were still there.

Conclusion #1. Comparison of the Experimental Group and the Ogden Group on the Winger Inventory was meaningless because they came from such different populations on this variable.

The pretest scores indicated that there was a significant difference on five of the six categories of the Winger when the Experimental Group male members were compared with the Experimental Group female members. The girls scored much higher.

Conclusion #2. *The girls in the Experimental Group were much less deviant in personality traits than were the Experimental Group boys, or, conversely, the Experimental Group boys tended to be extremely deviant in personality traits from both the girls in the Experimental Group and from what might be anticipated from male high school graduates of the same age*.

Even though not directly under investigation, the pretest data indicated that the total girls in the three groups were significantly better than the boys (.01) on five of the six Winger categories.

From a comparison of beginning vs. ending scores among groups, the following were derived. Even though the Ogden Group was a vastly superior group at the outset than either of the Salt Lake Groups, its members nonetheless made significant improvements in three areas of the Winger: Appearance (.05), Social Behavior (.05), and Personality (.05).

Conclusion #4. *The project in Ogden did have value in improving the students in the area of personality as measured by the Winger*.

Even though the Control Group was significantly different from either the Experimental Group or the Ogden Group at the outset, they showed significant (.01) increases on both Social Behavior and Winger Total.

Conclusion #5. *Apparently just being in a program where some attention and care was given to this type of student will result in significant improvements*.

Members of the Experiment Group did improve in all six areas of the Winger. Four (Appearance, Social Behavior, Personality, and Total) were highly significant (.001) and one (Total) was significant (.01). The sixth approached but did not reach the .05 level of significance.

Conclusion #6. The OSCICT did aid in making highly significant improvements in the areas measured by the Winger.

An analysis of the differences, or improvements, when compared, turned up three significant (.05) items: (1) Experimental Group improved significantly moreso than the Ogden Group on Authority, (2) Experimental Group female members improved moreso than Ogden Group female members on Authority, and (3) Experimental Group female members improved moreso than Ogden Group female members on the Winger Total.

This again would substantiate conclusion #6 that indeed the OSCICT did lead to more significant improvements in the Experimental Group members than was demonstrated in either of the other two groups.

Hypothesis #4. The Experimental Group members would show an improvement in the area of Achievement as measured by the Iowa Tests of Educational Development by having higher ending scores than beginning.

The following four tests from the ITED battery were given:

Test #1: Understanding Basic Social Concepts
Test #4: Ability to do Quantitative Thinking
Test #5: Interpretation--Social Studies
Test #9: Use of Sources of Information

In addition a total score was recorded.

The pretest scores indicated that as a total, the three groups did not differ significantly on any of the ITED measurements. This was not true when analyzing sexes. When comparing the Experimental Group male members with the Experimental Group female members, it was uncovered that the girls were significantly higher on ITED #9 (.01) and on the ITED Total (.05).

Conclusion #1. It was apparent that at the outset the girls in the Experimental Group were academically better prepared than were the boys in the Experimental Group.

Though not under direct investigation, another observation was that the girls in the Ogden Group likewise were significantly higher (.05) than the boys in the Ogden Group. Also, it was noted that they had significantly more education (.01) than did the boys which probably accounts for this finding.

The Ogden Group male members were significantly (.05) academically better prepared than the male members of the Experimental Group.

Conclusion #2. It was meaningless to compare the boys in the Ogden Group with the boys in the Experimental Group because of a significant difference at the outset in total academic preparation.

When comparing the improvements one with another, the total groups had no significant differences. However, after breaking the groups into male and female, it was discovered that the Experimental Group female members improved significantly (.01) moreso than the Control Group female members.

Conclusion #3. The OSCICT did indeed seem to have the anticipated effect as the female members of the Experimental Group improved significantly moreso than the female members of the Control Group.

Conclusion #4. Inasmuch as the Experimental Group did indeed improve in every area of the ITED measurements, the hypothesis was substantiated.

Hypothesis #5. The Experimental Group members would show an improvement in the area of Potential Ability as measured by the Lorge-Thorndike by having higher ending scores than beginning.

The pretest scores indicated that Experimental Group female members were significantly higher than (.05) the Control Group female members on the Lorge-Thorndike. This impact was felt, as the total Experimental Group was significantly higher than the total Control Group, but the boys were comparable.

Conclusion #1. The female members of the Experimental Group had significantly more academic potential at the outset than did the male members.

Conclusion #2. Inasmuch as the male members of the Experimental Group decreased slightly on the posttest, the hypothesis was not substantiated.

PART III

SUMMARY

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to test the ability of the OSCICT to improve those students in the Experimental Group in five areas: (1) Social Attitude, (2) Personal Problems, (3) Personality, (4) Achievement, (5) Potential Ability. Five tests were selected and/or developed to measure the anticipated improvements: (1) California "F" Scale, (2) Mooney Problem Checklists, (3) Winger Behavior Inventory, (4) Iowa Tests of Educational Development, and, (5) the Lorge-Thorndike Mental Measurement.

In an attempt to make the measurements more meaningful two other alledged similar groups were also pre and posttested at the same time.

The results of this investigation are summed up as follows:

1. It was found to be virtually meaningless to compare the Experimental Group with either the Control Group or the Ogden Group:
    a. Several factors indicated that it was meaningless to compare the Experimental Group with the Ogden Group: (1) the Ogden Group female members were significantly older and therefore demonstrated much more mature scores on the sub-parts of the Mooney, and, (2) the Ogden Group members were significantly higher at the outset on five of the six

categories of the Winger, and (3) the male members of the Ogden Group were significantly academically better prepared at the outset than the Experimental Group male members.

   b. Several factors indicated that it was difficult to compare the Experimental Group with the Control Group because of significant differences at the outset, the most significant of which were four of the Mooney items (BG, PG, SC, and Total).

2. It was difficult to measure the Experimental Group as a total because an analysis of male and female members indicated that there were significant differences at the outset: (1) the girls were much less deviant in personality traits, (2) the girls were better prepared academically than the boys, (3) the female members had significantly more academic potential at the outset than did the male members, and, (4) the girls were significantly younger.

3. Four of our hypotheses (improvement on Social Attitude, Personal Problems, Personality, Achievement) were substantiated by having the members of the Experimental Group show an improvement on the posttest scores over the pretest scores. While some of these increases were not statistically significant, the substantiation still seems to be defensible for several reasons:
   a. The Experimental Group, in the same setting with the Control Group, showed improvements while the Control Group did not.

   b. The initial reluctance of students to make items concerning their personal problems at the outset, may reflect higher scores at the end simply because the fear to indicate them was no longer there.

   c. The improvements were highly significant (.001) in the six areas of personality adjustment on the Winger, while both the Ogden Group and the Control Group increased in fewer areas and also statistically less significant (.05).

4. The fifth hypothesis, improvement on the Lorge-Thorndike, was not demonstrated to any degree of significance even though all three female groups and two of the male groups did improve.

II. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of this study the investigator makes the following recommendations:

1. Because of the extreme significance (.001) demonstrated in the Experimental Group in the areas of the Winger Behavior Inventory, the investigator recommends the OSCICT as an effective method for improving a maladjusted under-achiever in the areas of personality deficiencies.
2. Further investigation was suggested by the completely abnormal scores of all three groups on the California "F" Scale. Scores averaged approximately ten times higher than normal scores.

3. Further investigation is needed in the area of Personal Problems as measured by the Mooney Problem Checklists, as the subjective responses of enrollees indicated almost unanimously that they believed they had solved many of their problems while enrolled, and yet still checked almost as many problems at the posttest as they did on the pretest. The implication seems to be that this type of person is reluctant to divulge his most personal problems until complete rapport, trust, and confidence has been established between faculty and student.
4. A follow up study is recommended on the members of the Experimental Group to ascertain the effect of the OSCICT to carry over beyond the training period into the world of work. Perhaps a follow up and comparison with the other two groups would have some meaning.
5. The OSCICT is recommended for use in another project where the enrollees would have more time to actually demonstrate academic achievement. The techniques call for quite some time to develop the right atmosphere in the group setting before the five major components can be used. With the type of enrollee in the projects this time needed is even longer, leaving a relatively short time for academic improvement.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

Fromm, Eric. Man For Himself. New York: Holt, Reinhardt, and Winston, 1960.

Maslow, Abraham H. Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper & Bros., 1954.

Murphy, Gardner, Human Potentialities. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1961.

Rogers, Carl R. On Becoming a Person. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1961.

B. LECTURES

Kubie, L. S. "Neurotic Distortion of the Creative Process," Porter Lectures, Series 22. Lawrence, Kansas: University of Kansas Press, 1958.

Mead, Margaret. "Culture and Personality Development: Human Capacities," Semi-Centinnial Lectures, Rice University. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963.

C. PERIODICALS

Barnes, Regina. "Ninth Year Language Art Courses for Potential Dropouts," High Points, 46 (June, 1963), p. 62.

Dugan, Ruth. "Investigation of the Personal, Social, Educational, and Economical Reasons for Success and Lack of Success in School as Expressed by 105 Tenth Grade Biology Students," Journal of Educational Research, 55 (August, 1962), p. 544.

Garbarim, M. "Delinquency, Dropout and Related Problems," Michigan Educational Journal, 40 (January, 1963), p. 349.

Giesse, Richard J. " A Closer Look at Dropouts," Texas Outlook, 47 (January, 1963), p. 24.

Greene, Bert I. "Dropouts and the Elementary School," National Elementary Principals, 42 (November, 1962), p. 53.

Healy, Sandra L., and H. A. Otto. "Adolescents' Self-Perception of Personality Strengths," Journal of Human Relations (Accepted for Publication.)

Hoyt, Kenneth B. "The Counselor and the Dropout," Clearing House 36 (May, 1962), p. 516.

Huber, Mildred. "Profile of a Dropout," California Education, 1 (November, 1963), p. 3.

Kristan, Carl V. "Meeting the Needs of School Dropouts," Chicago School Journal, 44 (December, 1962), p. 119.

Lichter, Solomon O. "Prevention of School Dropouts," School and Society, 90 (April, 1962), p. 160.

Maslow, Abraham H. "Fusions of Facts and Values," The American Journal of Psychoanalysis, 23 (January, 1963), pp. 117-131.

Matthews, Charles. "The Serious Problem of the School Dropout," Illinois Education, 50 (January, 1962), p. 209.

Otto, H. A. "The Personal and Family Strength Research Projects: Some Implications for the Therapist," Mental Hygiene, 48 (July, 1964), pp. 439-450.

Otto, H. A. "Personal and Family Strength Research and Spontaneity Training," Group Psychotherapy, 27 (June-September, 1964), pp. 143-148.

Riendeau, Albert J. "Facing Up to the Dropout Problem," Clearing House, 36 (May, 1962), p. 524.

Staines, J. W. "Self-Picture as a Factor in the Classroom," British Journal of Educational Psychology, 28 (June, 1956), pp. 97-111.

Videbeck, R. "Self-Conceptions and the Reactions of Others," Sociometry, 22 (December, 1960), pp. 351-359.

D. PUBLICATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT

United States Department of Labor, in co-operation with the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Manpower Administration Office of Manpower Policy, Evaluation, and Research, Curtis C. Aller, Director. Washington: U. S. Printing Office, 1962. 0-796-857.

E. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

Brookover, W. B., and others. "The Relationship of Self-Image to Achievement in Junior High School Subjects," Cooperative Research Project No. 845. East Lansing, Michigan: Office of Research and Publications, Michigan State University, 1962.

Otto, H. A. "Human Potentialities Research at the University of Utah." Salt Lake City: Graduate School of Social Work, University of Utah, 1965. (Mimeographed.)

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

WINGER BEHAVIOR INVENTORY

WINGER BEHAVIOR INVENTORY

An instrument to measure changes associated with improvements in self-concept. Designed to be self-administered or given by the teachers. (When checking scores, consider all those you know of corresponding age and background.) It can also be used by the teachers and counselors as an evaluation of individual progress.

Name ______________________________ Date ______________

Rate each item from 0 to 4 - rarely, seldom, sometimes, generally, always
or, terrible, poor, fair, good, excellent

	0	1	2	3	4
1. Appearance					
Neatness					
Grooming					
2. Social Behavior					
Manners					
Acceptance of Social Values					
Compatibility (getting along with others					
Poise					
Leadership ability					
3. Personality					
Competitiveness					
Enthusiasm					
Ambition					
Self-Confidence					
Determination					
Initiative					
4. Attitude toward authority					
Cooperativeness					
Respect for law					
Willingness to follow direction					
5. Other Traits					
Independent work habits					
Withstand stress					
Interest in learning					
Tenacity					

APPENDIX B

PRETEST SCORES

TABLE XXVIII

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP PRETEST SCORES

Measurement	Male	Female	Total
Iowa Test of Educational Development #1	21.8	26.4	23.4
Iowa Test of Educational Development #4	7.6	10.3	8.5
Iowa Test of Educational Development #5	17.3	21.4	18.6
Iowa Test of Educational Development #9	18.1	25.3	20.5
California F	45.5	48.8	46.6
Mooney—Health and Physical Development	5.8	7.3	6.3
School	6.9	7.8	7.2
Home and Family	3.7	6.1	4.5
Money, Work, the Future	7.3	6.6	7.0
Boy and Girl Relations	5.0	5.8	5.2
Relations to People in General	6.8	8.4	7.3
Self-centered Concerns	7.7	10.8	8.7
Total	43.3	51.8	46.1
ITED Total	64.8	83.4	71.0
Lorge-Thorndike	79.2	88.9	82.4
Winger—Appearance	36.6	43.3	38.8
Social Behavior	77.8	102.8	86.1
Personality	80.9	110.1	90.6
Authority	50.8	70.9	57.5
Other	57.4	83.5	66.1
Total	303.5	410.5	339.2

TABLE XXIX

CONTROL GROUP PRETEST SCORES

Measurement	Male	Female	Total
Iowa Test of Educational Development #1	22.2	22.3	22.3
Iowa Test of Educational Development #4	7.5	6.8	7.2
Iowa Test of Educational Development #5	16.7	22.2	18.8
Iowa Test of Educational Development #9	18.2	21.4	19.5
California F	48.9	43.8	47.0
Mooney--Health and Physical Development	4.4	5.8	4.9
School	4.9	5.1	5.0
Home and Family	2.9	3.0	3.0
Money, Work, the Future	5.6	4.3	5.1
Boy and Girl Relations	2.8	2.5	2.7
Relations to People in General	3.6	4.7	4.1
Self-centered Concerns	5.2	6.3	5.6
Total	29.2	31.8	30.2
ITED Total	64.6	72.7	67.7
Lorge-Thorndike	73.4	76.2	74.5
Winger--Appearance	42.1	44.8	43.1
Social Behavior	82.1	88.0	84.4
Personality	88.2	94.8	90.7
Authority	50.1	57.3	52.8
Other	60.1	65.4	62.2
Total	322.5	341.8	330.0

TABLE XXX

OGDEN GROUP PRETEST SCORES

Measurement	Male	Female	Total
Iowa Test of Educational Development #1	27.3	24.7	25.9
Iowa Test of Educational Development #4	9.6	8.8	9.2
Iowa Test of Educational Development #5	22.8	20.8	21.7
Iowa Test of Educational Development #9	20.8	28.6	24.9
California F	46.4	44.6	45.5
Mooney—Health and Physical Development	4.3	4.0	4.2
School	4.8	4.9	4.8
Home and Family	2.6	4.2	3.4
Money, Work, the Future	5.1	4.6	4.8
Boy and Girl Relations	2.9	2.3	2.6
Relations to People in General	4.7	5.8	5.3
Self-centered Concerns	6.8	6.9	6.8
Total	31.1	32.7	31.9
ITED Total	80.4	82.9	81.7
Lorge-Thorndike	80.0	78.8	79.4
Winger—Appearance	38.2	49.1	43.9
Social Behavior	109.8	130.1	120.5
Personality	124.8	140.0	132.8
Authority	76.7	93.4	85.5
Other	88.1	102.2	95.5
Total	437.7	514.8	478.3

TABLE XXXI

TOTAL GROUP PRETEST SCORES

Measurement	Male	Female	Total
Iowa Test of Educational Development #1	22.9	24.5	23.5
Iowa Test of Educational Development #4	7.9	8.6	8.2
Iowa Test of Educational Development #5	18.0	21.5	19.4
Iowa Test of Educational Development #9	18.6	24.9	21.1
California F	46.9	45.8	46.4
Mooney—Health and Physical Development	5.0	5.8	5.3
School	5.8	6.0	5.8
Home and Family	3.2	4.4	3.7
Money, Work, the Future	6.3	5.2	5.8
Boy and Girl Relations	3.8	3.6	3.7
Relations to People in General	5.3	6.4	5.7
Self-centered Concerns	6.6	8.1	7.2
Total	36.1	39.1	37.3
ITED Total	67.4	79.5	72.2
Lorge-Thorndike	77.2	81.5	78.9
Winger—Appearance	38.9	45.5	41.5
Social Behavior	84.9	105.6	93.1
Personality	91.2	113.5	100.0
Authority	55.0	72.7	62.0
Other	63.7	82.6	71.2
Total	333.7	416.9	366.6

VITA

Name	Leland Joseph Winger
Birthplace	Ridgedale, Idaho
Birthdate	March 5, 1919
Education	Jordan High School, 1937 B. S., Utah State University, 1948 M. S., Utah State University, 1950 Doctoral Work, University of Utah
Certificates	Vocational Agricultural Counselor, Professional Remedial, Professional General Administrative
Organizations	Utah Educational Association National Educational Association Phi Delta Kappa Eta Pi Mu EMBA GLMA VFW
Professional Activities	State Representative, NEA Teachers' Conference, 1964 Vice-President, Salt Lake Teachers' Association, 1963 President, Salt Lake City Teachers' Association, 1964-66 Member, Board of Trustees, UEA, 1965-68 Board Member of UCIE, 1966-67 and 1967-68 Teacher Representative, SLC PTA Council 1963-64, 1965-66
Professional Positions Held	Teacher, Weber High School, 1948-55 Teacher, Salt Lake School District, 1955-65 Assistant Director, Oquirrh Manpower Program, 1965-66 Director, Oquirrh Manpower Program, 1966-68

PART IV

FOLLOW UP

SIX MONTH REPORT

To further analyze the value of the Otto Self-Concept Improvement Counseling Technique (OSCICT) as a technique in dealing with maladjusted under-achievers (high school dropouts) a follow up study was made six months after each group completed training at the Projects.

To make this follow up report more meaningful, it has been divided into four parts. In Part I is discussed the vocational training groups formed and conducted at the Projects. Part II contains a detailed description of the populations used in this study. In Part III the details of planning and administering the follow up study are recorded. Finally, Part IV deals with the findings from the follow up and their implications.

I. VOCATIONAL TRAINING

The Salt Lake Project was designed for approximately eighty-five enrollees. Each enrollee was tested and placed in classes according to his level of achievement. Most were in need of considerable basic education, plus intensive, personalized counseling, before entering into one of the five separate and distinct pre-determined vocational areas. Because of the abilities, capabilities, and needs of the enrollees, the five anticipated training programs were later modified to better suit the enrollees' needs.

As an end result, five vocational training programs were carried out, with the following numbers of trainees enrolled: fifteen in a foods training program, fifteen in a mechanics program, sixteen in a warehousing program, twenty-two in the first business training section, and sixteen in the second business section.

Because of the limitations imposed by this study, only sixty-six of these eighty-four enrollees were included.

The smaller Ogden Project evolved similarly, and had approximately twenty students enrolled in a business training program.

For a number of reasons (time, facilities, funding, and preparation of enrollees) each of the training programs varied both as to starting date and length of training course.

II. POPULATION

As indicated earlier, the populations--experimental, control, Ogden--used in this study were drawn from Special Youth Projects, financed under the Federal Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, and administered by the Salt Lake City and Ogden School Districts during the 1966-68 school years.

Not too much personal data was recorded on the Ogden group because the main variables investigated in this study were the measurements described in the early chapters of this study.

In the Salt Lake Group (where the OSCICT was used) however, early in the program each enrollee in both the experimental and control groups were interviewed, using a Personal Data Sheet which recorded educational history, work history, date of birth, height and weight, parent's name and address, and the name and address of a brother or a sister.

Later in the program, after rapport had been developed with most enrollees, another personal interview was conducted. This second interview was conducted by the faculty member who it was believed had the best rapport with the individual. This interview dealt with delinquency records, personal habits—smoking, drinking, and drugs--religion, and marital status.

The total results of these interviews can be found on Table XXXII. Among the characteristics were found the following:

1. In the Salt Lake Group, 63.6 per cent had jail or juvenile court records.
2. Almost one out of five had served time in our State Industrial School (19.7%).
3. Approximately 75 per cent smoked and drank.
4. Glue sniffing and drugs had been tried by almost 30 per cent.
5. Living at home were 40 per cent, married 36 per cent. This means that almost one-fourth of these youngsters were on their own, with no family ties.
5. While not shown on the table, all but one of the students enrolled were high school dropouts.
6. Almost 30 per cent had children.

While no detailed records were available on the Ogden Project, it was known that only one or two of the Ogden Group had delinquency records, most were single and lived with their parents, and several were high school graduates.

TABLE XXXII

POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS OF SALT LAKE ENROLLEES

Characteristic	Experimental	Control	Total
Jail or Juvenile Record	58.3	70.0	63.6
State Industrial School	16.7	20.0	19.7
Married	27.7	46.7	36.4
Divorced	8.3	6.7	7.6
Children	30.5	26.7	28.8
Live with Parents	47.2	33.3	40.9
Smoke	75.0	73.7	74.2
Drink	77.7	80.0	78.8
Glue	27.7	30.0	28.8
Drugs	33.3	23.3	28.8
Church Attendance	8.3	20.0	13.6

III. PLANNING THE FOLLOW UP

It seemed apparent from the many times individual students changed place of residence during the training that locating students for a six month follow up would be difficult. Two precautionary steps were taken:

1. While each student was interviewed using the Personal Data Sheet, their parent's names and addresses, and the name and address of a brother or sister were recorded.
2. Students were advised that there would be a follow up six months after leaving school and to be prepared to supply needed information.

Several steps were taken in preparation for the follow up. A follow up questionnaire was designed consisting of nine questions about employment after leaving the project. In it were included questions about pay, pay raises, and job descriptions. One question asked whether or not the student had entered the military service.

A schedule of dates for sending out the questionnaire was developed because each of the training programs had different terminating dates from the projects. Questionnaires were mailed on the scheduled dates.

A thirty-day time limit was set for their return. A new questionnaire was sent to all those who did not return the first one within this thirty-day period.

IV. RESULTS

Returns from the questionnaires were few. Seven were returned from the enrollees in the foods program, three from the mechanics, two from the warehouse group, two from business Section #1, two from business Section #2, and none from the Ogden Group.

The Department of Employment Security in Salt Lake City and Ogden also made a six month follow up. Returns were less than those above.

In order to have enough information to report on the follow up, telephone calls and personal visits to homes, friends, and relatives, resulted in limited information on thirty-four enrollees, in addition to the sixteen returning questionnaires.

Inquiries were made on the total group enrolled. Returns were even more dismal when only those were used which were included in this study. The returns from the populations used in the study were as follows:

1. Five questionnaires returned in the Salt Lake Control Group.
2. Seven returned in the Experimental Group.
3. None returned in the Ogden Control Group.

Thus, only twelve out of eighty-five were returned. Also, many of those returned were incomplete.

V. FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Findings

Three separate and distinct findings seemed to emerge:

1. The most striking was that the type of individual enrolled in the Projects is difficult to follow. They change residence constantly, do not leave forwarding addresses, and in many cases even close friends and relatives do not know their whereabouts. In six months most of them vanish.

2. There were not sufficient returns for statistical analysis.
3. The returns from the enrollees in the foods program were good--seven out of fifteen.

Conclusions

Three conclusions can thus be drawn from our three findings:

1. Following this type of individual after six months is virtually impossible.
2. It cannot be concluded either that the OSCICT does or does not carry over to the world of work as data were not sufficient to analyze.
3. Following graduates is apparently easier to do when the school is still in session. Seven returns from the fifteen graduates of the foods program can no doubt be attributed to the fact that it was the first vocational program completed and, therefore, the six months follow up after its completion was done while the school was still in session with the other vocational groups. The graduates of this program were still in somewhat regular contact with the school and/or students.

Recommendations

In turn, three recommendations are made:

1. It is recommended that for future studies of this kind, the follow up be more refined. Some possibilities for improvement are:
   a. Funds allocated for tracing the movements of enrollees.

  - b. Perhaps graduates ought to be checked once each month and progress noted until the sixth month.

2. Follow up study should only be used where the training institution is continuing. Once faculty and students are dispersed contacts are lost.
3. The OSCICT study should be replicated, using a more refined technique for following up to ascertain its effectiveness for carrying over into the world of work.